# DEVELOPING A STRATEGY FOR CREATING AN ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE FOCUSED ON MANAGING COMMUNITY RISK

LEADING COMMUNITY RISK REDUCTION

By: Kraig S. Stovall
Englewood Department of Safety Services – Fire Division
Englewood, CO

An applied research project submitted to the National Fire Academy as part of the Executive Fire Officer Program

May 2005

## ABSTRACT

This research project evaluated the nature of organizational culture and how it is influenced to determine what strategies could be employed to foster a cultural change in the Englewood Fire Division (EFD). The type of culture targeted was one that promoted and reinforced a fire services approach focused on the proactive management of community risk. The problem the EFD faced was the challenge of changing an organizational culture that is predominantly reactive and response-oriented. The purpose of this research project was to develop strategies for the creation of an organizational culture focused on managing community risk.

Evaluative and descriptive research methods were utilized to determine (a) the nature of organizational culture and how it is influenced, (b) what the current organizational culture of the EFD is, (c) what the key elements of an organizational culture focused on reducing community risk are, and (d) what strategies can be employed to change the culture of the EFD towards a focus on reducing community risk.

The procedures included a literature review of resources defining organizational culture, describing how it is influenced and describing the key elements of an organizational culture focused on managing and reducing risk. A survey of 57 EFD personnel (100% sample) was also used to evaluate the current culture of the organization.

The research identified the nature of organizational culture as well as numerous methods of influencing organizational culture. The survey identified three important underlying assumptions that characterize the organizational culture of the EFD, one underlying assumption of a key EFD subculture, and two espoused values. The research further identified various elements of cultures that embrace the management of risk. Finally, the research provided several

recommended strategies for introducing and reinforcing an organizational culture that is founded on the proactive management of community risk.

As a result of the research, recommendations were made that included further assessment of the current organizational culture, the training of leadership in the establishment of an organizational vision and planning process, the establishment of a vision in accordance with the desired cultural change and numerous recommendations for establishing and reinforcing the new culture.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Englewood Department of Safety Services – Fire Division serves a 6.5 square mile urban community of approximately 34,000 people in the State of Colorado. The Englewood Fire Division (EFD) is a career fire service organization that provides a broad spectrum of emergency and risk management services to the community including fire suppression, Advanced Life Support (ALS) EMS and transport, mitigation of hazardous materials incidents, technical rescue, fire safety education and fire prevention. The EFD employs 57 full-time members, including administrative staff.

The EFD has embraced a variety of fire prevention and education efforts the past three decades, however, it has not moved from a predominantly traditional response oriented mode of operations during this time. Current management envisions the Fire Division moving towards a risk management model of service to the community. It is believed that for the EFD to continue to provide meaningful service to the community in the future, a greater focus on the reduction of emergency risks is necessary. In this model, the Fire Division will continue to provide reactive services when necessary (i.e. emergency response and mitigation), but will provide ever-increasing resources and focus towards proactive measures of reducing community risk (i.e. education, engineering and enforcement). For this change of focus to occur, the EFD must work to change its organizational culture. The problem is the desired change runs contrary to a traditionally response-oriented fire service and the culture that has evolved to support it.

The purpose of this applied research project is to develop strategies which will assist the Englewood Fire Division in establishing an organizational culture that will comprehensively support a proactive approach to community risk management. With this purpose in mind, the research will attempt to answer the following questions:

1) What is organizational culture and how is it influenced?
2) What is the current organizational culture of the Englewood Fire Division?
3) What are the key elements of an organizational culture focused on reducing community risk?
4) What strategies can be employed to change the culture of the Englewood Fire Division towards a focus on reducing community risk?

## BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Like many fire service organizations, the Englewood Fire Division has incorporated fire prevention and educational efforts in its service to the community for many years. However, these efforts have always been considered secondary to the primary function of the Fire Division, i.e. emergency response and mitigation. This order of priorities has been easily observed by anyone paying attention to those services and functions immediately suspended or severely cut back when the city encounters any economic difficulties requiring budget reductions. The EFD recently experienced the effects of this combination of priorities and budget difficulties in 2003 when it was "forced" to eliminate 2 risk management positions, the fire safety education specialist and an assistant fire marshal.

Another factor which contributes to this ordering of priorities is the percentage of the operating budget allocated to emergency response personnel, personnel that are largely represented by a local employee's association. Typically, any change in the above mentioned priorities and/or the traditional fire service culture is seen as a threat to the membership of the local employee association, which is then vigorously lobbied against.

In spite of these obstacles, the upper management of the EFD increasingly favors a

change of priorities and organizational culture towards a risk reduction model. In management's view, such a change would better serve the community from the standpoint of minimizing human suffering and loss. Basic logic supports the idea that it is preferable to seek to minimize or eliminate fires altogether than to successfully extinguish a thousand fires and rescue countless victims from the ravages of flame. Few people in the fire service would debate the fundamental contention that prevention is better than suppression. However, the traditional view of the fire service as 'the people who run into burning buildings when others are running out' is a difficult image to overcome, internally and externally. Additionally, the EFD must work to become proactive in the prevention of the other emergencies to which it responds, such as EMS and hazardous materials. Thus, the need exists to begin to strategize towards an internal cultural shift in the EFD. To do this one must understand organizational culture, how it is developed and changed.

This research addresses the course content of the National Fire Academy's Leading Community Risk Reduction course under Unit 3*: Building Support*. Specifically, the paper will seek to "analyze organizational attitudes towards risk reduction" and "identify strategies for building organizational equity for community risk reduction". This research also supports the U.S. Fire Administration's operational objectives of reducing the loss of life from fire by 15%, reducing firefighter deaths by 25%, and by addressing community risk management easily integrates into the process of involving the local fire service in the creation of a multi-hazard risk reduction plan.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Though somewhat dated, organizational psychologist Edgar Schein's book *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (1992) remains one of the pioneering and most respected works describing the nature and development of organizational culture. Dr. Schein bases his description of organizational culture on an anthropological model. This model, argues Schein, gives the leader/manager a better understanding of the behaviors of the people in his/her organization, behavior that is often difficult if not seemingly impossible to interpret. The behavior of individuals in organizations is often mysterious until one has an understanding of the dynamics of culture. Schein observes:

> If we understand the dynamics of culture, we will be less likely to be puzzled, irritated and anxious when we encounter the unfamiliar and seemingly irrational behavior of people in organizations, and we will have a deeper understanding not only of why various groups of people or organizations can be so different but also why it is so hard to change them (1992, p. 5).

Schein distinguishes between the leader and the manager by describing the leader as one who creates and changes organizational culture while the manager is one who lives within it. It is, therefore, the role of the leader in an organization to recognize and correct the elements of an organization's culture that may be counterproductive or maladaptive to its success or survival (1992).

The term organization is simply another term for a group. Groups that have a common history, according to Schein, will generally develop a culture. Group or organizational culture surrounds those things that are shared or held in common by the people of the group or organization. Some of the shared phenomena linked to culture in organizations include:

- *Observed behavioral regularities when people interact*: i.e. language, customs, rituals and traditions unique to the group.
- *Group norms*: i.e. standards and values that a group develops and adheres to.
- *Espoused values*: i.e. publicly stated principles and values that a group claims as goals.
- *Formal philosophy*: i.e. general policies and principles that are applied to business dealings.
- *Rules of the game*: i.e. "the rules for getting along in the organization, 'the ropes' that a newcomer must learn to become an accepted member" of the organization.
- *Climate*: i.e. the way the members of an organization relate with each other, customers, and other outsiders, including the sense the physical layout of the organization communicates.
- *Embedded skills*: i.e. the unique abilities that members of the organization demonstrate in performing tasks, particularly the ability to informally pass on certain traits to the next generation.
- *Habits of thinking, mental models and/or linguistic paradigms*: i.e. the framework guiding the "perceptions, thought and language" utilized by the members of an organization and which is conveyed to newcomers early in their indoctrination to the group.
- *Shared meanings*: i.e. the understanding of each other that occurs as members of a group relate to each other.
- *Root metaphors or integrating symbols*: i.e. "the ideas, feelings, and images groups develop to characterize themselves". These may or may not be overtly recognized, but

are reflected in the physical layout, buildings and other "material artifacts" of the organization. (Schein, 1992)

To summarize, culture reflects the cumulative shared learning of a particular group leading to the development of shared basic assumptions at cognitive, emotional and behavioral levels. Based on this, Schein gives the following definition of culture: "It (culture) is a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (1992, p. 12).

Schein describes three basic levels of culture: *artifacts, espoused values* and *basic underlying assumptions*. Artifacts are the elements of culture that are visible to a newcomer when he/she first is introduced to the group. Artifacts include behavior, processes, buildings, language, style of dress, methods of personal interaction, myths and stories, published values, rituals, ceremonies and the like. Artifacts may reflect espoused values and/or underlying assumptions to the outsider, or they may not. It is only after spending time with a group that the meaning of artifacts can be ascertained with any degree of certainty (1992).

Espoused values involve the stated strategies, goals and philosophies of an organization. It is at this level that many observers believe the key to culture is found. The espoused values of a group describe what the group senses "ought to be as distinct from what is" (Schein, 1992, p 19). However, Schein argues, it is not until the values of an organization are put to the test, i.e. they are found to really work or reflect what is true, and thus bring the group a measure of success in solving its problems, that they become basic assumptions. The basic underlying assumptions of an organization, therefore, are generally unassailable because they are tried,

tested and true within the context of the organization. Therefore, basic underlying assumptions are taken for granted and are generally viewed as nonnegotiable. It is here where the intrinsic power of culture resides. Stated values may be debated and may or may not reflect underlying assumptions. In other words, values may reflect what a group will say in a given scenario, but underlying assumptions operate in what they will do. Schein writes: "in analyzing values one must discriminate carefully between those that are congruent with underlying assumptions and those that are, in effect, either rationalizations or only aspirations for the future" (1992, p. 21).

Basic underlying assumptions, to review, involve ideas or values that have proven repeatedly to be solutions to problems an organization has faced. Over time these assumptions are taken for granted and become accepted as reality, i.e. as *the way things are*. As such, they are often held beyond awareness at an unconscious level and provide cognitive stability for the members of an organization. To attempt to debate, challenge or confront a group's basic underlying assumptions creates a destabilization of the reality the assumptions are foundational to. This destabilization is generally unwelcome as it creates anxiety and is thus responded to defensively. Leaders trying to change organizational culture must understand this point (Schein, 1992).

While the basic underlying assumptions of an individual may be easily challenged when they are not externally supported, the basic underlying assumptions of a group are very difficult to change because they are shared and thus are reinforced by all members. The key to the nature of a group's culture is the interrelationship of its basic underlying assumptions. By gaining an understanding of these assumptions, one can better interpret and address the other levels, i.e. artifacts and espoused values (Schein, 1992).

An organization's basic assumptions are a product of two dimensions of group dynamics. First, the organization must develop a paradigm that allows it to survive and adapt to its external environment. Second, it must develop internal integration processes to ensure its continued ability to survive and adapt. A group gains its identity and develops its culture as it builds shared basic assumptions surrounding these two dimensions of growth and survival. Generally speaking, a group addresses external survival and adaptation by engaging in an agreement on the following five elements:

1. *Mission and strategy* – i.e. what is the primary task or reason the group exists
2. *Goals* – i.e. objectives based on the primary task or mission of the group
3. *Means* – i.e. how will the goals be accomplished
4. *Measurement* – i.e. what will be the criteria used to determine if the goals are being met
5. *Correction* – i.e. what will be the strategies when goals are not being met (Schein 1992)

To ensure the ability of an organization to adapt to and survive in its external environment, it must achieve consensus on the following internal integration processes:

1. *Creating a common language and conceptual categories* – i.e. a means for members to communicate effectively with each other
2. *Defining group boundaries and criteria for inclusion or exclusion* – i.e. how does the group define itself and what determines membership?
3. *Distributing power and status* – i.e. what is the group pecking order and how is it established?
4. *Developing norms of intimacy, friendship and love* – i.e. what are the rules for how these facts of human relationships will be managed within the context of the organization's business?

5. *Defining and allocating rewards and punishments* – i.e. what behavior is the basis for an award or punishment and what does each entail?
6. Explaining the unexplainable – ideology and religion – i.e. how will unexplainable events be given meaning? (Schein, 1992)

At a deeper level, organizational culture is underpinned by basic assumptions related to truth, time, space, and human relationships. These more abstract assumptions impact all of the elements listed above and must be understood before the more surface elements of the culture can be interpreted and changed. Schein illustrates:

> For example, organizational missions, primary tasks, and goals reflect basic assumptions about the nature of human activity and the ultimate relationship between the organization and its environment. The means chosen to achieve goals will reflect assumptions about truth, time, space and human relationships in the sense that the kind of organization that is designed will automatically reflect those deeper assumptions. Similarly, the measurement system and assumptions about how to take corrective action will reflect assumptions about the nature of truth and the appropriate psychological contract for employees (1992, p. 95).

As the assumptions concerning reality (truth), time and space and human relationships are held at the deepest levels, these assumptions are the most difficult to dislodge and create the most anxiety and uncertainty when tampered with. The leader who wants to influence cultural change must understand the nature and relationship of these foundational assumptions within his/her organization. One critical aspect to recognize is that these assumptions do not exist in isolation from each other, but formulate a complex system of beliefs. One cannot attempt to challenge or change the thinking related to one without impacting the others to some degree. Because of the

complexity involved in a cultural change for an established organization, experts suggest the process may take as long as ten to fifteen years (Schein, 1992).

Before an organization's culture can be changed, it must be studied and assessed. The underlying assumptions must be discovered and analyzed. It must be determined if the basic underlying assumptions of the organization that are the foundation of its culture are a hindrance to its survival and/or success and must therefore be changed. In many cases, a major cultural overhaul is unnecessary and the existing underlying assumptions can be drawn from to assist in necessary changes that are needed (Schein, 1992).

The first step in assessing the need for a cultural change is to understand the basic underlying assumptions that form the basis for the existing culture. This process cannot succeed unless an organization has a purpose or need for assessing its culture in the first place and is willing to cooperate in the assessment. Especially important is the support and commitment of the organization's leadership for the assessment process. Since the underlying assumptions of a group are shared, the process of discovery must be a group process. The process of discovery that Schein (1992) proposes starts with the gathering of a group of people selected by the organization based on their connection with or importance to the issue or problem facing the organization. A consultant then introduces the group to the concepts of artifacts, espoused values and basic underlying assumptions and assists them in identifying these components of their organization's culture. Once the group has a grasp of the basic underlying assumptions that form the basis for their organization's particular culture, the specific assumptions that are relevant to the issue or problem at hand must be identified. Once the relevant assumptions have been identified, these must be differentiated into those assumptions that are perceived as assisting the organization in achieving its goals or solving its problems and those that hinder.

Schein argues that it is often discovered in the analysis that solutions to the initial problems or issues can be implemented within the existing cultural framework. The establishment of new practices does not necessarily need to be accompanied by a wholesale change in organizational culture (1992).

According to Schein, organizational cultures emanate from the following sources:

1. The beliefs, values and assumptions of organizational founders
2. The learning experiences of group members as their organization evolves
3. New beliefs, values and assumptions brought in by new members and leaders (1992)

At the inception of an organization the culture is driven primarily by the vision, values and beliefs of the founder or leader. After an organization has had time to develop and its members have been through multiple experiences that confirm the vision of its founder, the members of an organization will begin to incorporate the founder's assumptions and a culture will be established that reflects the founder's vision and assumptions. If the founder/leader's vision is not confirmed, the organization will either dissolve or the group will select a new leader. Once the founder's assumptions are embedded in an organization through repeated successes, it is extremely difficult to change the culture of the organization while the founder is still in place. If the environment changes and the organization's original assumptions become counterproductive to its survival or success, the organization must change its assumptions or it will cease to exist. Since such a change in basic underlying assumptions is difficult while the founder/leader is still in control of an organization, usually such a change requires the introduction of a new leader or visionary to the organization (1992).

For a new leader to succeed in significantly changing the culture of an organization a condition(s) must first exist that creates disequilibrium in the coping mechanisms of the

organization. This disequilibrium begins a process Kurt Lewin describes as *unfreezing*, or the creation of a motivation for change. Unfreezing, according to Schein involves three necessary conditions, all of which must be present for cultural change to successfully occur. First, there must be *disconfirming data*. Disconfirming data are "any items of information that show the organization that some of its goals are not being met or that some of its processes are not accomplishing what they are supposed to" (1992, p. 299). Second, this disconfirming data must be associated with important goals and ideals resulting in *anxiety and/or guilt* within the organization. Finally, sufficient *psychological safety* must accompany both the disconfirming data and the anxiety/guilt such that change can be embraced. Psychological safety is a sense of the promise of, and confidence in, solving the problems presented by the disconfirming data without compromising organizational identity or integrity. Psychological safety is required for the members of an organization to admit disconfirming data rather than deny it (1992).

New leadership can provide an essential element in the unfreezing process by providing *vision*. Vision serves to give an organization the prerequisite psychological safety to embrace cultural change. The essence of vision is the introduction of a means of solving an organization's problems that had not been previously recognized. Vision, then, gives the promise and confidence that equilibrium can be regained without the sacrifice of the organization's integrity or identity. Vision has no meaning without the presence of disconfirming data, however, and it only becomes important when such data exists and the organization's members are hurting as a result (Schein, 1992).

The importance of new vision when cultural change is required cannot be overemphasized. Vision provides the necessary comfort for an organization to proceed with change. The change brought about by the new vision will be subjected to the same tests that the

original vision was subjected to, however. If the alternatives suggested by the new vision do not fulfill the promise of solving an organization's disconfirming data, the new leader, along with his/her vision will be abandoned. However, if the new vision eases the crisis in an organization and the new leader is credited, his/her assumptions will begin to become embedded and reinforced within the organization (Schein, 1992).

Vision does not always need to be provided by the head of an organization. Often, especially in large organizations, a subgroup or a subculture, or its leadership, may provide the test platform for embracing new assumptions. If the new assumptions are successful within the subgroup/subculture, other subgroups/subcultures of the organization may experiment with and adopt the same assumptions with time. In the end the overall culture of an organization may be altered in this manner, albeit, slowly (Schein, 1992).

Once cultural change is initiated, there are a variety of mechanisms that a leader may use to reinforce and embed his/her basic assumptions. First, a leader can embed assumptions through what he/she systematically "pays attention to, measures and controls on a regular basis" (Schein, 1992, p. 231). This is a powerful method of influencing assumptions provided a leader is consistent. Emotional reactions are especially powerful in embedding important values, beliefs and priorities. In contrast, what a leader does not pay attention to also sends an important message (1992).

Second, a leader can communicate assumptions through "how he/she reacts to critical incidents and organizational crises" (p. 231). Crises create excellent opportunities for learning because of the emotional intensity associated with such events. Crises create anxiety. When strategies and methods selected by a leader reduce organizational anxiety, the associated assumptions are remembered (1992).

Third, leaders embed culture through "observed criteria for resource allocation" (1992, p. 239). Priorities and assumptions are communicated through the manner in which money, personnel and materials are allocated within an organization. What leaders deem important is funded and supported. If what is funded and supported succeeds, the assumptions surrounding the allocation of resources are embedded (1992).

Fourth, what leaders "deliberately model, teach and coach" becomes embedded in the assumptions of an organization (1992, p. 240). This method of embedding assumptions certainly includes the formal aspects of teaching and transmitting the values and methods of an organization through training and orientation. However, it is most powerful when it is communicated through informal means by the behavior of the leader and other key members of the organization (1992).

Fifth, organizational assumptions are communicated through the "observed criteria for allocation of rewards and status" (1992, p. 242). Leaders can very effectively establish their priorities and values by linking visible rewards and punishment to behaviors they are trying to either encourage or discourage respectively. This means of embedding culture is closely associated with what leaders pay attention to, and similarly, is dependent on consistency to be effective. Inconsistency in this arena creates confusion and conflict within the culture of an organization (1992).

Finally, organizational culture is solidified through the "observed criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement and excommunication" of members (1992, p. 243). The selection of new members is an especially potent means of solidifying organizational assumptions. When a leader consciously or unconsciously hires members in harmony with his/her vision for the organization, the culture is strengthened accordingly. Promotional criteria,

retirement and excommunication are directly linked with what an organization rewards and punishes. These particular mechanisms are very effective means of both reward and punishment, again, if applied consistently (1992).

Schein offers that the most effective culture that can ultimately be developed in an organization is a *learning culture*. A learning culture is designed to continuously monitor its environment and to automatically introduce needed change as the environment dictates. Keys to a learning culture are the assumptions that 1) the organization has the ability to manage its environment, 2) the reasonable manner for humans to act is as proactive problem solvers and learners, 3) solutions to problems come from a pragmatic search for truth, 4) humans are fundamentally good, or at minimum, changeable, 5) both the individual and the group are important sources of creativity and learning, 6) a mid-future focus is the best for planning and assessing the effectiveness of an organization, 7) the free flow of information and open communications are the best means to accomplish organizational goals, 8) diversity gives an organization the best chance to successfully respond to an ever-changing environment and the unpredictability of the modern world, 9) both task and relationship are important to optimal productivity, and 10) the ability to deal with complexity and difficulty in predicting outcomes will contribute to long term organizational success (1992).

Schein concludes with the assertion that the leaders of tomorrow's organizations must set the example as learners:

> "Learning and change cannot be imposed on people… The more turbulent, ambiguous, and out of control the world becomes, the more the learning process will have to be shared by all the members of the social unit doing the learning. If the leaders of today want to create organizational cultures that will themselves be more amenable to learning

> they will have to set the example by becoming learners themselves and involving others in the learning process" (1992, p. 392).

Guldenmund (2000) differentiates between organizational culture and *organizational climate* and the relative importance of each to a culture of safety. Based on Ekvall's work (1983), Guldenmund describes organizational climate as the "common characteristics of behavior and expression of feelings by organizational members" (p. 220). Guldenmund argues that climate is principally a psycho-social construct, whereas culture is primarily an anthropological one. Some scholars, according Guldenmund, believe that organizational climate relates to job satisfaction and is more of a concern to the middle management level, while organizational culture is the business of top management. Guldenmund echoes Schein's belief that organizational climate is a reflection of an organization's underlying culture and not equal to it. Guldenmund concludes:

> The term organizational climate was coined to refer to a global, integrating concept underlying most organizational events and processes. Nowadays, this concept is referred to by the term organizational culture whereas the term organizational climate has come to mean more and more the overt manifestation of culture within an organization, therefore, climate follows naturally from culture or, put another way, organizational culture expresses itself through organizational climate (2000, p. 221).

According to this line of thinking, organizational climate is related to attitudes. Beliefs and convictions, on the other hand, arise from culture. However, Guldenmund points out, beliefs and convictions may be the building blocks of attitudes. From a safety culture standpoint, attitudes about safety or risk arise from the core beliefs, dogmas and convictions of the organizational culture. Guldenmund's work basically resembles Schein's in the conclusion that true cultural

change must occur at the level of core beliefs and convictions that are frequently held unconsciously. Attitudes may or may not reflect these underlying beliefs and convictions, or as Schein would describe them, underlying assumptions. Attitudes can be adjusted through training and other means, however, for the culture to truly be described as a safety culture, the shared beliefs and convictions of an organization must be altered (2000).

James (1996) identifies nostalgia as a significant barrier to cultural change. James writes; "Nostalgia locks us into beliefs about the way things were that may have little or no basis in reality…. Why is nostalgia a problem? Because is makes us less able to adapt to change." (1996, p. 128). James tags certain organizations with the term *lodges*. Lodges, she asserts, are organizations whose cultures are rooted in nostalgia. Lodges are not so much concerned about the success of what they are doing as they are with how long they have been doing it. Lodges "create intimacy through shared ideals and beliefs, ceremonies, stories, and legends, and depend on it for their survival" (1996, p. 128). James warns, however, that organizations that assume the future will be no different than the past are doomed. She suggests that a careful study of history can be a good cure for the mistaken idea that the past was better than the present, or the future.

Lodge cultures, according to James, promote an unrealistic view of life and work because of a nostalgic mindset. Lodge cultures are *sealed cultures* with strong traditions, rigid hierarchy, and within which demands for loyalty and secrecy predominate. The lodge way is the right way, the only way. The problem with tradition based organizations, however, is they don't perform well during periods of rapid change because their focus is in the past. What lodge cultures lack is vision. In fact, the unwritten rule in organizational cultures that are steeped in lodge mentality is, "do not bring the old gods down if you want to be one of them" (1992, p.

139). Leadership in lodge organizations is often focused on reaping the rewards of past successes, rather than looking to build the future. As a result, new ideas promoted by young leaders are usually viewed with suspicion or abandoned if they pose any risk to present leadership getting their due (1996).

James corroborates many of Schein's observations as to what leaders do to embed or promote a specific culture. James suggests evaluating the following elements of an organization as clues to its culture:

1. What do leaders pay attention to and talk about?
2. How are rewards and status determined?
3. Compare managerial training programs with actual executive behaviors.
4. Do organizational leaders behave as colleagues or kings?
5. How does management respond to organizational crises?
6. Do the recruitment, selection, promotion and retirement policies favor one group or diversity?
7. What is the nature of the organization's structures, systems, and procedures?
8. Do the formal statements of organizational philosophy reflect reality?
9. What impression is created by the organization's buildings and physical layout?
10. Who is invited and what occurs at company meetings and conferences?
11. What does the organization spend its resources on?
12. What are the stories organizational leaders tell about important events and people? (1996, pp. 141-143)

James again echoes Schein in the assertion that leaders can effect change in lodge organizations through the process of changing the assumptions upon which the lodge is built.

The first task is to identify the basic assumptions of the existing culture through observation and analysis by answering the questions indicated above. James suggests talking to employees to find out why they work for the organization, what their primary motivators and barriers are, and what their perception of the real goal or vision of the organization is vs. the formally stated one. Many leaders are deluded in terms of the levels of satisfaction, trust and participation that employees feel. James' research indicates that most employees want similar things from their work in an organization. First, they want to learn and grow; next, they want to be independent and have a measure of control over their work; third, they want to be connected to others in the organization and to be involved; finally, employees want an explicit goal or vision with a driving force or principle behind it to follow (1996).

To be effective, James suggests that leaders must identify the nature of their business, what is their top priority, whom the organization has to please (i.e. stockholders, customers, owners etc.), the organization's relationship to the community and environment, the nature of their relationship to their employees, whom they will reward (along with why and how), and what the long-term goal of vision of the organization is going to be. The chief complaint employees have, according to James, is that their leaders do not follow through. The answer, James insists, is in developing a clear organizational vision (1996).

Organizational culture change, according to James, follows closely what psychologists have identified as the five stages of grief. In the first stage there is *denial*. The organization continues to function according to outdated and ineffective assumptions in spite of evidence in their environment that these assumptions are no longer working. Typically, the lower levels of an organization are the first to come out of denial and the top levels are last. The next stage is *anger*. Organizational anger occurs when it is finally recognized that outdated basic assumptions

have failed, have let the organization down and the resulting damage/loss is experienced. At this stage leaders and employees begin to look for someone or something to blame. Once anger subsides, an organization experiences *bargaining*, a last ditch effort to keep things the way they are while attempting to appear to embrace change. Change at this stage is usually only surface level and doesn't impact the long held, but no longer valid, basic underlying assumptions of the organization. The turning point for true cultural change is the stage of *acceptance*. At this stage the organization has finally recognized that the old assumptions are no longer valid and are gone forever. This stage can be accompanied by great excitement and enthusiasm as the organization is finally open to change. This stage can also be unsettling for an organization as it seeks to establish new direction and identify new assumptions. Finally, an organization begins the *rebuilding* stage. A new direction is established and accepted at this stage and leadership begins to rebuild trust based on new underlying assumptions, giving birth to a new organizational culture.

Bruch and Ghoshal (2004) suggest that organizational culture must be built around leaders that promote purposeful action. To accomplish this, members of an organization must internalize the organizational mission and goals. The authors write; "That means crafting a shared vision and a set of common values that everyone authentically subscribes to – not as an externally imposed constraint, but as a personal source of identity and meaning" (2004, p. 117). In such a culture mutual support and cooperation are maximized and resources, information and effort are shared. Again, a single-minded vision is the key to cultural change and organizational success. An organization must define what business it is in and make it clear to everyone in the organization.

Bruch and Ghoshal use the analogy of a family to describe a type of organizational

culture wherein the members seek not only their individual success, but assist with and take pride in the success of the other members, and where all the members work together to see the family (organization) succeed. British Petroleum's (BP) Peer Challenge is used as an example. In this process BP's managers are required to present their economic and business plans to their peer group for approval and support prior to getting approval from top management. It is this type of practice that embeds the culture of cooperative teamwork that BP is trying to promote. The greatest hindrance to establishing a culture, according to Bruch and Ghoshal, is for an organization's leaders to talk about one thing and do another. Any effort to establish a culture must be supported by an organization's structures and management processes.

> Senior management will inevitably seek to, and to some extent must try to restrict certain kinds of choices. It will usually do so both formally and informally by policies and procedures and by the culture it seeks to create to guide managers' behavior. Senior management needs to know what kind of culture and what kind of managers it really wants (Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004, p.128).

Consistency of vision and its impact on the process of embedding an organizational culture is so critical that managers that do not support or follow the culture that leadership is trying to foster must be dismissed, even if they are successful in other measures. Top level leadership must also model the values they are trying to embed. What leadership says matters little; it is what leadership does that inevitably shapes the assumptions of an organization (Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004).

Collins (2001) underscores the importance simplicity of focus and vision to organizational culture using an illustration developed by Isaiah Berlin from the ancient Greek parable about a fox and a hedgehog:

> Foxes pursue many ends at the same time and see the world in all its complexity. They are "scattered or diffused, moving on many levels," says Berlin, never integrating their thinking into one overall concept or unifying vision. Hedgehogs, on the other hand, simplify a complex world into a single organizing idea, a basic principle or concept that unifies and guides everything. It doesn't matter how complex the world, a hedgehog reduces all challenges and dilemmas to simple – indeed almost simplistic – hedgehog ideas. For a hedgehog, anything that does not somehow relate to the hedgehog idea holds no relevance (2001, p. 91).

Collins defines what he calls the *Hedgehog Concept*, which involves the intersecting pieces of three circles coming together to define organizational vision. The first circle is – *what you can be the best in the world at*; the second, *what drives your economic engine*; and the third, *what you are deeply passionate about*. What you can be best in the world at goes beyond mere competency. An organization's vision should encompass what they seek to do better than anyone else. What drives your economic engine defines the key economic denominator of your organization. "Think about it in terms of the following question: *If you could pick one and only one ratio – profit per x (or, in the social sector, cash flow per x) – to systematically increase over time, what x would have the greatest and most sustainable impact on your economic engine?*" (2001, p. 104 – italics in original) What you are deeply passionate about describes just what it says. It is not about developing a passion, but discovering what you are already passionate about and making it the focus of your vision.

In his book *Re-Imagine!*(2003), Tom Peters points out the need for businesses to change their cultures in relation to a world that is dramatically different today than it was even a decade ago. Peters exclaims, "If you don't like change, you're going to like irrelevance even less"

(2003, p. 17). According to Peters, change on a global level is rapid and gaining speed. Major paradigm shifts that took a thousand years in ancient times are now taking only a decade. Things are changing so fast, in fact, that organizations not only don't know the answers to many questions, but may not even know what questions to ask. The impact on organizational cultures is profound. Long-term organizational strategies are now measured in weeks instead of years. The terms *confusion* and *ambiguity* are the new hallmarks of the current age for organizations. The fundamental idea of what gives an organization value is being redefined. As an example, Peters cites the massive change in profitability that Harley Davidson experienced when they changed the vision and description of their organization from "Vehicle manufacturer" to "Lifestyle Company".

Peters argues for an organizational culture that embraces mistakes and failure. Failure indicates that an organization is trying new things: "It is failure, not success, that makes the world go around. Because failure typically means that someone has stretched beyond the comfort zone and tried something new… and screwed it up… and learned something valuable along the way" (2003, p. 27). Peters bemoans the fact that in many organizations the primary goal is to avoid failure and embarrassment at all costs. Organizations that are busy avoiding failure will ultimately defeat themselves. Getting better incrementally over time is no longer enough. Only the organizational cultures that embrace the risk of investing in the untested and crazy, while experiencing their share of defeat, ultimately have the chance to succeed. "I sincerely believe that in turbulent times bosses at all levels and at all ages ultimately earn their keep by Blowing Things Up and Inventing a New Way…not by preserving and (merely)Making Better the Old Way" (2003, p. 32). Peters advocates the maxim "reward excellent failures, punish mediocre successes" as the only means forward in a world where confusion is the norm

(p. 198). A culture that fosters being bold, taking risks, experimenting and failing along the way is in large measure what Schein describes as a learning culture (2003).

Peters offers that organizational vision must be defined in terms of "WOW". WOW, according to Peters, describes goals and objectives that inspire. WOW describes projects "that matter, make a difference, that you can brag about, that transform the enterprise, that take your breath away, that make you/me/us/them smile, and highlight the value you add and why you exist" (2003, p. 196). It is this kind of organizational vision and culture that will lead to customers not just "being satisfied" or "having their expectations exceeded", but in becoming *raving fans* of the organization. It is this kind of vision that creates cultures that leave a legacy (2003).

To create the kind of culture Peters envisions, leaders cannot depend on their own ability to introduce organizational change, but must "find and celebrate change makers" (2003, p. 211). Leaders can no longer order a new culture into being; they need *heroes, demos and stories* (p. 213). Heroes are what Peters describes as *lead frogs* (i.e. if you want your organization to leap frog change, you need lead frogs). These are your visionary change makers, the revolutionaries that are oft-times hidden within an organization, afraid to go public for fear of the "old guard's wrath". Leaders seek these people out to blaze the trail for the rest of the organization. Peters analogizes these people as the germ carriers of the organization. If you want to infect others, honor and help the carriers and then expose others to them. 'Demos' describes what the heroes will do once the leader gives them the go-ahead. Demos are experiments based on the vision of the heroes that demonstrate the effectiveness of the new assumption; "Palpable proof that seriously cool change is not only possible – it's already under way!" (p. 215) Stories, as Dr. Schein asserted, are important elements of any culture and serve to reinforce its basic underlying

assumptions. Peters suggests that stories be used to showcase the organization's heroes and their best experiments (demos). Create more stories around the heroes by promoting and rewarding them when they succeed. Recruit more heroes with the stories - and the cycle continues as the culture is transformed. Peters concludes with the following challenge:

> New times call for… a New Mandate. Shake free of the past – including past successes – and re-imagine your entire way of doing business. The point is not to "push the envelope" or to "think outside the box." The point is… to rip up the envelope and to burn the box.
>
> My problem with both traditional phrases: They suggest that there is an intact envelope or sturdy box from whose known borders we can simply step out. But the envelope is torn and crumpled, and the box has been run over by a careening 16-wheel truck" (2003, p. 293).

Hiam (2002) echoes Peters' assertion that times are changing fast. According to Hiam "business is really just a series of adventures" (2002, p. 162). It is therefore critical that leaders manage transitions well. Part of managing transitions well is fostering the viewpoint that change is an opportunity that presents new challenges; otherwise, the troops can become defensive and dig in their heels. The successful leader recognizes the stress that cultural change brings and acts to provide clear direction (vision) and security (psychological safety – as per Schein, 1992) for the members of an organization. Good change managers are great communicators, seek to design work that fits the circumstances, are good listeners, and are encouraging and supporting of their employees says Hiam. Sometimes leaders react to changes that are already occurring, and sometimes good leaders initiate change. Whatever the case, great leadership is essential to ensure success (2002).

In order to initiate change leaders must create a sense of urgency. This closely corresponds to what Schein (1992) describes as disconfirming data, the idea that a turning point or organizational cross-roads has been reached. Without this sense of urgency it is difficult to get members of an organization to seek new solutions and embrace change. Once the organization has embraced the need for change, Hiam suggests it is time for the leaders to listen to the employees. As James (1996) points out, generally, the lowest level of an organization is the first to come out of denial. The employees can help often help guide change as the ones that are most familiar with what isn't working and what could. Employees can help an organization "sniff the wind" for signs of change in the environment. Great leaders, according to Hiam, spend time regularly talking with their managers and employees to find out what they have wondered about and/or noticed as signs of possible change (2002).

Great leaders must be adaptable to a fast-changing business environment, Hiam insists. Once trends are diagnosed, the change agent must be quick to act to reduce the negative impact on the organization. The goal is to be pro-active, not reactive. Change is easier to embrace and respond to when it is anticipated.

Once organizational change is introduced, employees need time to learn and practice the new behaviors required as a result of the change. People are often resistant to those systems, processes and philosophies that they do not have chance to learn and practice with. The successful change leader, therefore, will provide extended opportunities for the members of the organization to learn new assumptions and practice the associated behaviors, both to see that they work and to become comfortable with them (Hiam, 2002).

Krames (2003) offers the following quote from Jack Welch, CEO of GE, to emphasize the need for an organization to adopt a learning culture: "This boundaryless learning culture

killed any view that the 'GE' way was the only way or even the best way. The operative assumption today is that someone, somewhere, has a better idea; and the operative compulsion is to find out who has that better idea, learn it, and put it into action – fast" (p. 80). Krames echoes Peters' argument that organizational heroes are the agents of cultural change. It is the people with ideas that bring value to the organization; they must be rewarded and celebrated (demos and stories – as Peters, 2003). Krames again quotes Welch; "At GE it was not the stripes on one's shirt that determined one's worth to the company, but the quality of one's ideas" (2003, p. 85). The search for new and better ideas must never end if an organization wants to be competitive.

Krames describes the characteristics of a learning organization as follows:

1. In a learning organization information is shared and accessible.
2. In a learning organization learning is emphasized and valued. I.e. The organization spends money to learn and train.
3. In a learning organization mistakes and failures are not punished. (This echoes Peters' call for organizations that reward excellent failures and punish mediocre successes, 2003). "Nothing stifles innovation faster than punishing those who come up with new ideas that do not work out" (2003, p. 87).
4. In a learning organization learning is expected, it is a part of the culture, a reflex, a habit, and not random. Most importantly, it is modeled by the organization's leaders (2003).

Embedding a learning culture in an organization requires a number of key strategies, according to Krames. First, culture change is best initiated when the financial climate of an organization is stable. Second, the vision of the organization must be well articulated and become observable as the basis upon which decisions are made. Third, the organization must

have a clearly stated set of guiding values. These values must be backed up with action; even if it means that otherwise successful managers failing to comply with them are fired. Fourth, an organizational climate of trust and openness must be developed through meaningful dialogue between employees and managers. Fifth, a *boundaryless organization* must be cultivated. A boundaryless organization works to eliminate the barriers that typically separate managers and employees as well as different parts of an organization from each other, and strives for candor, openness and trust. Sixth, speed, flexibility and innovation must become habits. Speed - work must be done quickly and efficiently by the people that are in the best position to accomplish it. Flexibility – new ways of doing business must be readily embraced. Innovation – new ideas are valued and implemented rapidly without requiring multiple approvals. Seventh, make sure people seek out new ideas wherever they can be found, especially from competitors. Eighth, look for the best practices, i.e. the most efficient ways to do things, and implement them. Ninth, reward learning behaviors and actions that champion the culture. Tenth, establish the necessary processes and framework to allow learning to be transformed into results. Finally, use organizational initiatives to reinforce the desired culture (2003).

Krames argues that vision and patience are keys to changing an organization's culture. Progress in cultural change will generally be slower than desired; however, persistence pays off in the end. One reason cultural change can take longer than expected is the lack of a clear vision of what the new culture will look like. To change a culture, an organization's leaders must look outside of the organization, learning from customers and competitors. Genuine cultural change can take years under the best of circumstances. The most important focus, then, is to be faithful to your vision (2003).

Krames echoes Schein, James and Peters in suggesting that true cultural change is possible only as a result of organizational crisis. Without such a motivating event, few organizations will depart from past practices. Some leaders are able to instill a healthy degree of fear that keeps an organization resistant to complacency without crisis, but it is essential to true cultural change. Culture change can be assisted and reinforced by hiring the kind of people that will help promote the culture a leader wants to establish. Herb Kelleher of Southwest Airlines is Krames' example here. Kelleher looks for value in the intangibles, such as attitude and passion, as the keys to hiring the right people to support your culture. Krames suggests that an organization must develop its own list of traits it desires in an employee, traits that will help promote the desired culture. Krames agrees with Peters that it is important to reward and celebrate the successes of the people that are recruited and/or hired to help change the organizational culture. Through this process, these people become the role models and success stories upon which a culture is built and sustained.

Cook (1990) identifies the fire chief as the custodian of a fire department's culture. In order to manage the culture, the chief must understand its basic values and underlying assumptions. The chief is responsible to teach and model the culture he is trying to promote. To be effective the chief must recognize that the fire department exists in a wider culture of which it is a subculture and has subcultures of its own. Since each culture is built around its own common assumptions and values, the potential for different cultures to be in conflict is high. A fire organization's survival is depends on the Fire Chief's ability to understand these differences in cultures and to help his/her organization adapt where possible.

A downside of fire service cultures, according to Cook, is that in many cases they are deeply embedded and resistant to innovation and change. Cook argues that fire service cultures

must become dynamic in order to compete with other organizations (such as parks and police) for declining resources in their communities. When a culture becomes dysfunctional, it must be changed. This applies to both host cultures and subcultures, according to Cook. In fact, a dysfunctional subculture can destroy its host culture if it is not kept in check or changed (1990).

Cook observes that changing a fire department's culture is often difficult, if not impossible. Like Schein, Cook points out that cultures are based on underlying assumptions that are not easily deciphered by the artifacts of the culture (such as the color of a fire truck, or riding the tailboard). To change the culture, its underlying assumptions must be unfrozen and then refrozen based on new assumptions. A fire chief's vision is critical to this process. The fire chief must get the organization to buy into and trust his/her vision. As new members are added to the fire department, the culture will gradually change, and may, in time, become a culture that embraces change (1990).

If a fire department's culture is dysfunctional and cannot be changed, it may have to be destroyed and rebuilt. This is a last resort, according to Cook, and is a painful process for the organization. If the department's long-term success is at stake, however, it is worth the cost. Restoring the organization will involve removing old dysfunctional values and assumptions and replacing them with functional values and assumptions. Cook warns that a new chief must be very careful to delay initiating any kind of cultural change until he/she understands the assumptions and functions of the current culture well (1990).

Smallman (1996) performed a study that evaluated organizations from the standpoint of their strengths and weaknesses in managing risk. Smallman supports the cultural gurus in their assertions that the successful organizations of the future will "anticipate change and cut across boundaries" to gain support for change (1996, p. 13). Smallman describes two basic models in

the management of risk, the *reactive* model and the *proactive* model. "The reactive approach relies on institutions setting predetermined risk tolerances and to converting these goals into quantified decision rules" (p. 14). Smallman describes this approach as "event driven" and suggests that it is a fatalistic "Murphy's Law" type of approach, i.e. "if things can go wrong, they will". This is not the true management of risk, according to Smallman, because it predominantly involves risk-retention as opposed to reduction. True risk management Smallman suggests involves "risk avoidance, prevention, and reduction" (p. 14). This is the proactive or *holistic* model. Smallman explains; "The essence of this approach is we consider all risks and their interrelationships on a proactive basis, driven by potential risk and not by events" (p. 14). The objective is for organizations to strategically plan for the management of risk, using methods that are based on a profile from an on-going assessment.

Smallman argues for a "no blame" culture (1996, p. 16). He means by this a culture in which past mistakes are treated as opportunities for learning, rather than as occasions for attaching blame. Smallman suggests a strategy for managing risks that is based on a matrix of probability and severity. Those risks that are both highly probable and present a high level of severity in their impact can be strategically prioritized for management. The fatalistic organization will leave risk management here, however, whereas the holistic organization takes a comprehensive approach to risk in which all risk is identified and managed through one of four methods: *avoidance, loss-control, retention and transference.* Avoidance describes the process of avoiding exposure to an identified risk altogether. Loss-control involves those measures that are designed to limit or prevent the impact of given risks. Retention entails the acceptance of risk and its potential impact. Transference is the transfer of risk to another entity, such as to an insurance carrier.

Smallman identifies four types of organizations in relation to risk management:

- *Analyzers* – the most proactive. Analyzers engage in extensive ongoing environmental scanning and analysis.
- *Prospectors* – somewhat proactive. Prospectors engage in environmental scanning but miss some areas of analysis and fail to anticipate some risks.
- *Defenders* – tend towards a more reactive approach; defenders are generally unwilling to engage in environmental scanning. Defenders may investigate decisions from a narrowly defined and identified set of risks.
- *Reactors* – do not anticipate risk at all, are constantly in a reactive mode to risk, and tend to react ineptly.

Johnson (2002) argues that due to the dynamic nature of the fire service profession, risk management is integral to successful fire department planning. The management of risk, according to Johnson, crosses all phases of a fire department's activities. Good risk management allows the fire service organization to maximize its resources by helping to predict outcomes that are relatively uncertain and to manage these to an acceptable level. Outcomes can be predicted (as Smallman also indicates) on the basis of an analysis of probability and impact, once possible controlling (i.e. preventative) action has been considered. Johnson offers the following three principles for analyzing risk:

1. Adopt a consistent approach throughout the organization.
2. Ensure clear structure to the process.
3. Establish a framework for identifying risk and measures of control (2002, p. 17).

Vonada (1990) submits that fire service organizations must embrace change if they expect to continue to exist. The biggest mistake a fire service leader can make is to adopt the philosophy; "It's worked in the past so all I have to do is work at it harder" (1990, p. 32). Certain signs that a fire service organization is in distress and facing failure, according to Vonada, include justifying the organization's performance based on its call volume, past practices and/or outmoded methods. Call volume by itself is no longer a valid basis for the existence of the fire service, argues Vonada. When "fire calls account for approximately 4% and other emergency calls represent approximately 12% of the workload", these alone no longer justify the resources requested in a fire department's budget (1990, p. 32).

It is time for fire departments to reexamine their past paradigms, including such sacrosanct ideas as the 24 hour work shift and not doing business (other than running emergency calls) on Sundays. Fire organizations must become increasingly involved in active non-suppression activities, according to Vonada. It is these efforts that will keep the fire service viable in an age where automatic sprinklers and other advancing technologies are greatly reducing the threat of fire. Finally, Vonada advocates the need for the leaders in fire organizations to mentor their younger members with new objectives in mind. Mechanical and construction knowledge and skill, highly important in the past, must give way to educational and management skills if the workforce is to remain current with the demands of today's communities (1990).

Bergel (1997) states; "Historically, the fire service has been programmed to be reactive and to respond to events rather than to be proactive and to prevent events from taking place" (p. 10). While fire prevention advocates have talked about the three *Es* of education, engineering and enforcement, for the past 30 years, according to Bergel, the fire service has put its money

into the fourth *E* – extinguishment. Bergel argues that the fire service is changing and it is time to reassess what its primary mission is. To date, the fire service has not done a good job of assessing the educational needs of its communities. Fire prevention education efforts are woefully understaffed and are not based on real-world assessments of where the true risks to the community exist. Bergel asks the question; "Why only address fire prevention when EMS calls continue to outnumber fire calls?" (1997, p. 10). It is time, says, Bergel, for fire departments to expand their efforts in the educational arena (1997).

To be effective in bringing educational programs to the community, fire departments must perform needs assessments to find out what the real problems are. By targeting the true needs of the community the fire department can ensure that its citizens get the most value for their tax dollars. The key word, according to Bergel, is *target.* "To target means to study the community through an analysis of people who reside and work in your jurisdiction" (1997, p. 11). Bergel calls for a new paradigm in the fire service, one that is based on a different approach to life safety: "The life safety departments of the future will be energetic, exuberant and will interact with their communities, needs assessments will be on-going, and programs will be evolving as service personnel continually monitor what the public wants and needs" (1997, p. 11).

The Risk Support Team (RST), HM Treasury, UK, published a report titled *Creating a Risk Management Culture* in September 2004. The goal of the report is to assist Risk Managers in bringing about a cultural change in their departments through a variety of insights and suggestions. The report begins by stating that the proposed cultural change is a long-term goal, will be embedded by job plans (i.e. career paths) and clear objectives, and is expected to take from 5 – 7 years. The report attempts to address how cultural change will be initiated and

sustained until complete.

The RST report stresses leadership commitment as essential to the adoption of a new culture. One way leadership can be recruited is to insist that new leaders in the organization commit to the change when they replace leaders that retire or resign. Leaders must also be trained to understand culture and how they can assist with its transformation. Once again, a clear direction, or vision for change is a must for cultural change to occur. The direction/vision must then be successfully communicated to the organization through messages, rewards, decisions and actions (2004).

The RST recommends a process of training all employees in risk awareness as a tool for changing the culture. This training can occur through a variety of means, including formal classes, intranet messages and role models. Further change can be fostered by helping employees see the "what's in it for me" pay-offs. The importance of managing risk can be incorporated into individual performance appraisals, group planning sessions, policies and project management. The report warns organizations to be careful of *bottom loop bias*, a situation where the feedback relative to mistakes can overrule the potential rewards of change. Another key to developing a risk management culture is to get people focused on outcomes. The question that must be asked from a risk standpoint is, "what is the desired outcome". The best method to achieve the desired outcome is then the preferred method. For example, in the fire service, the best and most cost efficient method for reducing fire deaths (outcome) is not putting out fires more efficiently (a method), but rather eliminating the cause of fires altogether (a better method) (2004).

There are certain situations that provide an optimal environment to advance cultural change. One such circumstance is when an organization is going through restructuring or other

mandated changes. The fact that change is already occurring at many levels creates an openness to influence at a cultural level as well. Outside mandates such as legislation and regulation that impact an organization's operations can also present opportunities to change a culture. Finally, a crisis or a significant organizational failure (i.e. disconfirming data) can become an impetus for improving the culture by providing motivation for change (RST, 2004).

The RST advises that risk management can only become a part of the culture of an organization when it is embraced by all the members at all levels and not seen as the special responsibility of a few people. This requires that all personnel be trained, coached and mentored in managing risk. It is critical, according to the RST, that personnel be encouraged to identify risks associated with their work. Also, when employees make a wrong decision related to managing risk, they must be confident they will not bear the blame. Finally, organizations must encourage employees to learn from each other and from other organizations in their risk management efforts (2004).

In 2002 the UK performed an *Independent Review of the Fire Service* (IRFS). The authors of this review recommended that an increasing emphasis be placed on the prevention efforts of the fire service. "The key to avoiding the adverse consequences of fire is to prevent it from happening in the first place" (2002, Section 3.7). Additionally, the report suggests that resources assigned to intervention (i.e. suppression) be flexibly allocated based on a "reasoned risk assessment not a rigid prescription" (Section 4.1). A new focus on flexibility based on local circumstances and challenges will mean the fire service will be experiencing significant change. The IRFS identified the primary goal of the nation's fire service as "a reduction in the loss of life, injury, economic and social cost arising from fires and other hazards" (Section 4.3). The IRFS discovered that the fire service is chiefly organized with the objective of fire response in

mind. However, as fires constitute only 5-10 percent of the fire service's activities, it is predicted that this cannot be the fire service's focus in the future. The IRFS recommends the following as the responsibilities assigned to the fire service:

1. Risk reduction and risk management in relation to fires and some other types of hazard or emergency.
2. Community fire safety and education.
3. Fire safety enforcement.
4. Emergency response to fires and other emergencies.
5. Emergency preparedness coupled with the capacity and resilience to respond to major incidents of terrorism and other chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear threats (2002, Section 4.5)

The IRFS recommends that the government of the UK rename the fire service with a name reflecting its larger roles and responsibilities. The IRFS cites the following as the recommended objectives of the fire service:

1. Apply a risk-based approach to fire cover and to all its activities in deciding how best to use firefighters and other resources.
2. Focus on reducing the level of fire and other emergencies (i.e. prevention rather than intervention)
3. Develop and maintain effective partnerships with a range of agencies in the public, private, and voluntary sectors where these can deliver cost-effective improvements in community safety.
4. Adopt safe systems of working to secure the health and safety of both its staff and the general public.

5. Minimize the impact of the incidents it attends and of its response at those incidents on the environment (Section 4.8).

Firefighters, according to the IRFS, will require a wide range of skills and competencies in the future that their name no longer describes. As such, a more diverse work group is desirable as firefighters and these will enter the service at greater levels of experience and skill. The fire service will need to develop a culture that welcomes this diversity in the workforce. The IRFS recognizes that while the culture of the fire service will change, the aspects of trust and loyalty, so important in the present culture, are desirable to retain (2002).

The IRFS recognizes the necessity of a strong vision if the culture of the fire service is to change. "If the cultural change necessary to modernize is not supported by a clear vision about the type of service the government wishes to see, the barriers to change will be almost insurmountable" (2002, section 4.17).

According to the IRFS, the fire service today is focused on intervention with firefighters and apparatus as the primary means of reducing fire risk. The fire service must adopt an integrated risk-based approach to provide a greater level of service to the community. The integrated risk-based approach involves educating groups at risk and increasing fire safety measures based on a study of risks associated with these groups. Since such work must be done at a time and place convenient to the high-risk communities, the fire service will need to become more innovative and flexible to reach these populations. The IRFS asserts; "the prevention of deaths from fire through increased community fire safety measures must be among the highest priorities of the Fire Service" (2002, section 5.6). Often, the structure of the current work schedules and allocation of resources works against this priority. The IRFS proposes a need for change in the fire service, from a culture predominantly based on fire response to a culture based

on preventing fires from occurring. "Over time, the need for intervention should come to be seen as a failure" (Section 5.8). Such a sweeping change will take time; however, it can be expedited through the introduction of a framework for an integrated risk-based approach. Fire service planning and action must be focused on saving lives rather than providing a designated type of coverage for a particular type of incident. The integrated risk-based approach involves reducing coverage where there is little risk to life, increasing cover where the risk to life is high and increasing fire service involvement in prevention and protection activity. Fire districts must be mandated to develop their own risk management plans predicated on managing and reducing their particular risks. In keeping with the goal of reducing risk, fire organizations should receive funding based on the reduction of response and the saving of life as opposed to the money following the greatest demand for intervention.

In 2000, the Treasury Board of Canada (TBC) published a document entitled *Integrated Risk Management Framework* (IRMF). The IRMF is designed to provide a culture based on proactive risk management. An IRMF fosters a risk-smart environment "that supports responsible risk management where risk management is built into existing governance and organizational structures, and planning and operational processes" (TBC, 2000). According to the TBC document, "risk refers to the uncertainty that surrounds future events and outcomes. It is the expression of the likelihood and impact of an event with the potential to influence the achievement of an organization's objectives" (TBC, 2000). The "analysis of the likelihood and impact" suggests that risk may be evaluated and decisions made to reduce or eliminate it. Within the IRMF, risk management is "a systematic approach to setting the best course of action under uncertainty by identifying, assessing, understanding, acting on and communicating risk issues" TBC, 2000). In order to apply this approach successfully a risk management culture must be

developed.

Integrated risk management involves an on-going systematic approach to proactively understand, manage and express risk throughout an organization. It is a strategic exercise. Integrated risk management is not only concerned about the mitigation of risk but with innovative means of managing risk. The goal is finding the most cost effective means of reducing risk while achieving organizational objectives. An IRMF is fostered through the identification of risks, the communication by leadership of the appropriate risk management strategy, the application of a consistent risk management approach, and continual improvement in managing risk through shared experience and learning (TBC, 2000).

To create a culture that incorporates an IRMF, it must be reflected in the vision, policies, and operating principles of the organization. Furthermore, decision-making structures, job descriptions, performance appraisals and reward systems must support the vision. Finally, as is reflected by other studies, increasing risk awareness through formal training, shared experiences and practicing risk management skills all help embed the culture.

Marchone (1997) stresses the need for strong leadership in developing fire service cultures that value community education. Marachone argues, “If an organization values the concept of wellness and safety, its behavior, attitude and service will reflect those values. If we don’t set the example personally and organizationally, how can we expect more from the public?” (1997, p. 55). It is the responsibility of fire service leadership to sell the benefits of community education to employees and elected officials. Ultimately, community safety is a collaborative community wide effort, according to Marchone; “The responsibility to address these problems falls to the community as a whole and not just to one organization or one fire department” (1997, p. 54).

# PROCEDURES

## Definition of Terms

Artifacts**:** The phenomena that one sees, hears, and feels when one encounters a new group with an unfamiliar culture (Schein, 1992).

Basic Underlying Assumptions**:** Unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and feelings (the ultimate source of values and action) (Schein, 1992).

Boundaryless organization**:** An organization that works to eliminate the barriers that typically separates managers and employees, as well as different parts of an organization from each other, for the purpose of facilitating rapid change (Krames, 2003).

Bottom loop bias**:** A disincentive for change that occurs when the response to mistakes overcomes the rewards for successful cultural change (Risk Support Team, 2004).

Disconfirming data**.** Any items of information that show the organization that some of its goals are not being met or that some of its processes are not accomplishing what they are supposed to (Schein, 1992).

Espoused Values**:** The formally stated or published strategies, goals and philosophies of an organization (Schein, 1992).

Hedgehog concept: The intersection of three facets of organizational vision; 1) what you can be the best in the world at; 2) what drives your economic engine; and 3) what you are deeply passionate about (Collins, 2001).

Integrated risk management: An on-going systematic approach to proactively understand, manage and express risk throughout an organization (Treasury Board of Canada, 2000).

Lead frogs**:** An organization's visionary change makers (Peters, 2003).

Learning culture**:** A culture designed to continuously monitor its environment and to automatically introduce needed change as the environment dictates (Schein, 1992; Krames, 2003).

Lodge: Organizations whose cultures are rooted in nostalgia. Lodges are not so much concerned about the success of what they are doing as they are with how long they have been doing it. Lodges create intimacy through shared ideals and beliefs, ceremonies, stories, and legends, and depend on it for their survival (James, 1996).

Organizational culture: A "pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems" (Schein, 1992, p. 12; )

Organizational climate: The common characteristics of behavior and expression of feelings by members of an organization. Climate is the overt manifestation of culture (Guldenmund, 2000; Schein, 1992).

Psychological safety**:** The feeling of promise and confidence by members that an organization can overcome its problems without losing its identity or integrity (Schein, 1992).

Unfreezing**:** The process that creates the motivation for cultural change to take place. Unfreezing is contingent upon disconfirming data, anxiety and/or guilt and psychological safety.

Vision: A new means of solving an organization's problems (specifically the ability to remove the disconfirming data) that had not been previously recognized (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Peters, 2003; Krames, 2003).

## Research Methodology

The research methods employed by this project were evaluative and descriptive. The

evaluative segment of the research involved a literature review for the purpose of discovering the nature of organizational culture and how it is influenced. Also included in the literature review was a search for the elements of an organizational culture that promote reducing community risk, particularly from a fire service and risk management perspective.

A descriptive approach was used through the agency of a survey to assess the current organizational culture of the Englewood Fire Division. An 82 question survey was utilized and administered to 57 personnel across all ranks and assignments of the Fire Division (Appendix A). The sample was 100%, although not all respondents answered every question on the survey. The survey was developed with the assistance of an on-line survey corporation, *Question-Pro.com*. Question-Pro.com provided a base survey for the evaluation of organizational culture which the author modified slightly to suit his purposes. The surveys were e-mailed to all members of the Fire Division and the results tabulated anonymously by Question-Pro.

Based on the results of the literature review and the survey, recommendations were made to facilitate the change of the culture of the Englewood Fire Division towards a proactive focus on reducing community risk.

**Limitations**

The chief limitation for this research project involved the use of a survey to assess organizational culture. Both Schein (1992) and James (1996) recommend long term observation and an interview process as the best methods to determine the basic underlying assumptions of an organization. As the *National Fire Academy Executive Fire Officer Program Applied Research Guidelines* discourage the use of interviews for research purposes (p. A-10), and such interviews would have been difficult to conduct in the numbers required within the research timeline, this approach was rejected for this project. Such an interview process is included in the

recommendations, however. Schein in particular asserts that surveys of organizational culture at best give only hints of underlying assumptions, but may shed considerable light on organizational climate. Organizational climate can be an indicator of the underlying culture of an organization, but the artifacts that are generally exposed by a survey must be interpreted by someone familiar with the culture of the organization for the data to be meaningful from a cultural perspective. As the author is a long-standing member of the organization in question (25 years), it was his decision that he would be able to ascertain enough meaning from the data to make a reasonable evaluation of the organization's culture.

## RESULTS

**Research Question #1: What is organizational culture and how is it influenced?**

Organizational culture is a pattern of shared underlying assumptions that are generated in an organization as it successfully solves problems of internal integration and external adaptation over an extended period of time (Schein, 1992, James, 1996; Guldenmund, 2000). These basic assumptions are then passed on to new members of an organization as the appropriate means of deciphering, reacting to and solving problems. While artifacts of the culture may be observed by a newcomer to an organization in the behavior, dress, language and other trappings of the workplace and in the personal interaction of workers, their meaning in relationship to the culture can only be ascertained over time as the newcomer discovers the associated underlying assumptions they are based upon (Schein, 1992; Guldenmund, 2000). An organization's stated or espoused values, goals and philosophies may or may not give clues to its underlying assumptions. What an organization does, how it behaves in its approach to doing business and in relating to its people and customers, gives greater insight into its culture than what it says

(Schein, 1992; Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004).

Because an organization's culture reflects its beliefs and convictions related to truth, time, space and human relationships, it can be very difficult to change. Leaders that embark on a project of cultural change must recognize that they are tampering with their organization's fundamental understanding of reality. Because the cultural assumptions of an organization are so deeply rooted in what its members believe to be "the way things are", attempts to dislodge these assumptions can create significant organizational defensiveness and anxiety (James, 1996; Schein 1992).

Organizational cultures generally cannot be changed unless there is a motivating event or crisis to drive the change (Hiam, 2002; Schein 1992; James, 1996; Peters, 2003; Krames; 2003; RST, 2004). Generally, the motivating factor surrounds the failure of the underlying assumptions of the current culture to provide a means or approach to achieving the organization's goals. This disconfirming data, as Schein (1992) coins it, begins an unfreezing of the old culture's underlying assumptions and fosters an associated feeling of anxiety and/or guilt (or anger, according to James, 1996) in the members of the organization. The destabilizing of reality, as the organization has come to view it, provides an atmosphere that is open to change (Schein, 1992; Peters 2003; James; 1996; Hiam; 2002).

Once an organization is open to changing its culture, sufficient psychological safety must accompany the change for it to be embraced. Because of the destabilization that the questioning of previously held assumptions causes, leaders must provide new assumptions and answers that hold the promise of and hope for the organization to overcome its crisis and regain stability without sacrificing organizational identity or integrity (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Hiam, 2002; Cook, 1990). The primary key to providing psychological safety is the establishment of vision.

Vision provides promise and hope to members through a new approach to solving an organization's problems (Schein; 1996; Hiam, 2002; IRFS, 2002).

Vision is usually generated by the leader of an organization (often a new one) and must be single-minded, clearly defining the business and goals of the organization (Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004; Collins, 2001; James, 1996; Cook, 1990). One of the foremost desires that employees have in relation to their organization is a specific goal or vision that is supported by a driving force or principle (James, 1996). Collins (2001) suggests that vision be based around what an organization can be better at than anyone else, what supports the organization economically and most importantly what the members are passionate about. Peters (2003) advocates the idea that vision can come from within the organization and not necessarily from the leader(s). The leader's job is to find heroes he calls "leadfrogs" that are the visionary change makers in an organization and to give them the chance to succeed in demonstrating the viability of their vision (Peters, 2003; Krames; 2003; Schein 1992). This approach, however, means being willing to learn from "excellent failures" along the way (Peters, 2003; Krames, 2003). Overreaction to failure can stifle cultural change in an organization regardless of the perceived awards (RST, 2004). A new organizational vision is subject to the same tests that the original was. Over time the new vision must answer the questions and solve the problems of the organization with success or it will be abandoned (Schein, 1992).

Once an organization embraces a new vision the establishment of a new culture becomes possible. Building on the vision, organizational leaders can embed new supporting assumptions through a variety of methods. What a leader pays attention to, measures and controls sends a strong message about what is important in the new scheme. Employees hired specifically because the skills and abilities they possess complement the vision are a powerful reinforcement

to the culture. Who and what is rewarded and how, serves to communicate what the leader values and correspondingly what is valuable to the new culture. Where the organization spends its resources also serves to undergird the new vision. Another powerful reinforcement is the manner in which the leader responds to new organizational crises. Further crises create new anxiety and questions related to the new vision and culture. If the leader can successfully resolve new crises, his methods and successes will become the framework of the new culture. Closely associated with this is the example the leader sets through his/her behavior, coaching, mentoring, and modeling (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004; Peters, 2003; Krames, 2003; Cook, 1990).

Consistency of vision cannot be overstated in its importance to seating a new culture. If leaders do not practice what they preach, they will undermine the process. The follow through of leaders is extremely important in embedding a new culture with employees. So much so that managers who do not embrace the vision and culture of an organization should be dismissed, no matter how effective they are otherwise (Burch & Ghoshal, 2004; James, 1996; Krames, 2003).

Heroes, demos and stories are also important to embedding a new culture, according to Peters (2003). Heroes introduce new ideas and processes, the leader gets them to demonstrate these to the larger organization and celebrates their success, and finally, stories are generated about these successes to inspire others to similar ventures (Peters, 2003; Schein, 1992). Employees need time to practice and embrace new assumptions and the systems and processes generated by them. It is important to be patient and to provide the necessary training and time to practice new assumptions and their associated behaviors so these become comfortable to the employee (Krames, 2003; Hiam, 2002). Finally, the cultivation of a boundaryless organization contributes to the ultimate success of organizational change. A boundaryless organization

eliminates the typical barriers between managers and employees and between the different parts of an organization promoting a sense of teamwork, trust and cooperation in the pursuit of the vision (Krames, 2003; Peters, 2003; Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004; James, 1996; Hiam, 2002; Schein, 1992).

The best type of organizational culture to strive for is what Schein (1992) and Krames (2003) both characterize as a learning culture. The benefit of a learning culture is that it is always working to position itself for positive change as the environment dictates. A learning culture is constantly scanning its internal and external environment for the clues that change is in the wind and must be prepared for. A learning culture must be modeled by leadership, must believe in its ability to adapt, focuses on solving problems, expects, values and emphasizes learning, is practical in nature, has a high view of human nature, doesn't restrict the individual or the group, focuses on mid-range planning, promotes the free-flow of information both vertically and horizontally, doesn't punish mistakes and failures, embraces and values diversity as an answer to complexity, believes in the equal importance of both task and relationship and is able to successfully predict outcomes in the midst of difficult and complex scenarios (Schein, 1992; Bruch & Ghoshal; Peters, 2003; Hiam, 2002; Krames, 2003).

**Research Question #2: What is the current organizational culture of the Englewood Fire Division?**

The survey administered to the Englewood Fire Division (Appendix A) provided some insight into both the organizational climate and culture of the organization. The 57 respondents were from a mixed population in regards to age, organizational function, organizational level, and tenure. The survey was heavily weighted towards "line, non supervisor" personnel at 73.33 %. 97% of those indicating an educational level have at least some college. In comparing the

Fire Division with other fire service organizations, the respondents viewed the organization as either an “average” or “low performer” in all categories with the exception of fire suppression, which received a rating of “high performer”. This is consistent with an organization that has emphasized this role both in terms of its operations and budget over the course of its history. A newcomer to the Englewood Fire Division quickly learns that skill and aggressiveness in the suppression arena is highly valued, both through training and the interpersonal behaviors of fellow employees. The underlying assumption that this is the primary goal of the organization is clearly communicated through the structures, equipment, procedures, training and budget of the organization.

The cultural analysis portion of the survey suggests some general dissatisfaction associated with leadership, planning, vision, cooperation and communications. In terms of leadership, the respondents believe that decisions are not made at the level where the best information is available, that organizational goals are unclear and poorly understood and that planning is sporadic. Generally, employees have difficulty seeing the relationship between organizational goals and their work; believe that there is a discrepancy between what leaders say and do and that there is a poor alignment of goals across organizational levels. Employees also believe that the policies and procedures of the organization are not easily changed, that the organization responds poorly to change in the fire service and that new and improved methods are not readily embraced. Respondents are concerned that things seem to “fall between the cracks”, that there is poor organizational coordination and that there is no long-term purpose and/or direction. Members do not consider the EFD to be a model fire service organization, believe the mission is unclear and that there is no clear strategy for the future. Employees believe that there is no general agreement about goals and that leadership’s goals tend to lack

ambition and are unrealistic. Additionally, respondents generally agreed there are no stated organizational objectives, that the organization doesn't track its progress in relationship to its goals, that the people do not understand what to do to ensure organizational success, and that there is no common vision among the members for the future. In a positive vein, most personnel believe that the organization's approach to doing business is consistent and predictable, that authority is delegated appropriately and that people have the freedom to act within that authority.

In terms of vision, there is a general consensus that either there is no vision or it has not been clearly communicated by leadership. As a result, most employees are not motivated or excited about the vision. Also, since employees are generally ambiguous about organizational vision, there is the impression that the different parts of the organization don't share a common perspective. Employees are mostly neutral as to whether short-term demands compromise the organization's long-term vision. On an encouraging note, people were in general agreement that failure is viewed as an opportunity for improvement; however, in contrast, innovation and risk taking are not seen as rewarded behaviors. Learning and improving is recognized as an important day-to-day objective. Customer service and feedback are seen as an important key to decision making and the organization is seen as encouraging direct contact with customers. From the standpoint of what the business of the Fire Division is, most people believe prevention to be more important than suppression and believe that managing community risk is the primary purpose of the fire service.

On the issue of cooperation, there is agreement that cooperation across the different parts of the organization is encouraged. However, most respondents believe it is hard to achieve "win-win" solutions to disagreements or to achieve consensus on issues. The general position is that people in different parts of the organization come from divergent perspectives, that coordinating

with the same people is not easy and is like working with someone from an entirely different organization. Possibly due to the differing perspectives, people feel that it is hard to introduce change and that there is an extensive disagreement about goals.

Relative to communications, there is a widespread agreement that goals, vision, planning and purpose are not well communicated within the organization, and that decisions are often made at a level where there is insufficient information. While EFD personnel are almost evenly divided on the assertion that there is a clear set of values guiding the business of the organization, most are in agreement with the statement that ignoring core values will get you into trouble. Interestingly, most people agree that there is a common code of ethics that guides behavior and distinguishes between right and wrong. There is general consensus that the "right hand" doesn't know what the "left hand" is doing.

Teamwork is seen as more important to the organization than hierarchy as a means to accomplish tasks. In contrast to the view that it is difficult to find cooperation or agreement across the different levels of the organization, people view themselves as working within the framework of a team and teams are seen as the primary building blocks of the organization.

Employees generally believe they are highly involved in their work, however, are not convinced that they can have a positive impact in accomplishing organizational objectives and don't see the connection between their work and organizational objectives. Personnel generally believe that their capabilities are constantly improving and are an important organizational resource, but don't believe, as a rule, that the organization is willing to invest in developing their skills. Personnel don't believe that organizational problems are a result of their having inadequate skills for the job.

The open ended questions (Appendix A) on the survey reflect very similar concerns

related to vision, planning, leadership and internal communications. There are many calls for short, medium and long-range planning that reflects a proactive vision for the future. Also highlighted is the need for clearly communicated and adhered to goals and objectives. Lack of leadership and lack of confidence in leadership is frequently mentioned. The prevailing view is that leadership is unsupportive of line operations and effort, lacks vision for the future, is inconsistent in applying and enforcing policies and procedures, is poor in developing future leadership, doesn't value employees, and doesn't represent the Division's interests well with the City Administration and Council. Internal and external communication is viewed as lacking. The financial status of the city and its impact on the Division's ability to address many infrastructural needs is another frequently cited concern. Finally, low employee morale and sense of value to the organization and the city are common themes. The morale and value issues employees feel are often related to the vision, planning, communication and leadership issues identified above.

The question is what does all the above say about the culture of the Englewood Fire Division? In light of the data, the perceived lack of vision, leadership and support appears to communicate an underlying assumption that the line employee is not very important to the organization. This underlying assumption is reflected by leadership's failure to clearly communicate organizational goals and objectives and to help each employee see where he/she contributes to the accomplishment of those objectives. A low value of the employee is also communicated by the perceived lack of planning for and funding to develop and train personnel. Perceived failure of administrative staff to consistently apply policies and to be inconsistent in their words and actions also contributes to low trust and an uncooperative posture between the line and administrative staff of the Fire Division.

The general impression that the organization is disconnected in its purposes (i.e. “the right hand doesn’t know what the left hand is doing”) and doesn’t cooperate well to achieve goals suggests an underlying assumption that establishing a shared vision and setting associated supporting goals and objectives is not important to the organization. The perception that it is difficult to achieve “win-win” solutions to problems and people feel at cross purposes serves to reinforce this assumption.

Whether the organization values change is questionable. The consensus is that failure is embraced as an acceptable basis for learning, which would suggest a willingness to experiment with and try new things; however, innovation and risk taking are not perceived as rewarded behaviors. Constant improvement and learning is valued, but not viewed as supported by the organization. There is a mixed message here. My impression is that the organization has embraced an espoused value of learning and development, and to the degree that it is relatively low-cost, supports the value, but the underlying assumption appears to be that the organization does not support change when it involves risk or uncertainty to the organization.

There appears to be a recognized code of ethics and a perceived set of values that is communicated to the employees of the Fire Division. The perception is that violation of these ethics and values will result in some form of discipline. However, the open-ended responses suggest that there is a perceived inconsistency in how the values and ethics are enforced, which creates an issue here. The “espoused value” appears to be that having a high ethical standard and doing the right thing is important, but the perception that leadership isn’t consistent in the application of the value keeps it from becoming a shared underlying assumption.

Teamwork is perceived as being the means by which the organization accomplishes its tasks, and teams are viewed as the primary building blocks of the organization. The sense of a

lack of cooperation between the different segments of the organization, however, and their inability to work towards common goals seems to suggest this is another espoused value and not an underlying assumption. Because the fire service is built around small company level teams, there may be an underlying assumption here that relates to that particular subculture that has not translated to the larger culture of the organization.

The importance of customer service appears to be an underlying assumption that is embraced by the entire organization. Customer feedback is considered important to decision making and the organization encourages its members to have direct contact with customers. As a service that is committed to risking life to save others lives, the EFD embraces the underlying assumption that it exists to serve the community. There may be considerable disagreement amongst the members as to what that service should look like, but the general purpose is agreed on.

To summarize, the survey has identified three possible basic underlying assumptions of the Englewood Fire Division as an organization. The first is that the line employee is not valued by the leadership of the organization. Though some would protest this assumption, the perceptions suggested by the survey support this conclusion nonetheless. The second basic underlying assumption is that a shared vision based on consensus planning and goal-setting is not especially important to the organization. Third, the fire service exists to serve its customers. Teamwork is another underlying assumption that appears to be held by a subculture of the organization, the fire company, but has not yet been embraced by the organization at large. Additionally, there appear to be two espoused values that fail to stand the test of underlying assumptions. First, the idea that a common code of ethics and set of values are a guide to the operation and behavior of the organization is kept from being a shared underlying assumption

due to perceived inconsistent application. Second, the promotion of positive change remains an espoused value due to the fact that the organization is unwilling to expose itself to risk or uncertainty to realize its benefit.

**Research Question #3: What are the key elements of an organizational culture focused on reducing community risk?**

An organizational culture focused on reducing risk must embrace a proactive or holistic program of risk avoidance, prevention and reduction (Smallman, 1996; Bergel, 1997; Johnson, 2002; IRFS, 2002). A genuinely proactive organization considers risk based on potential and not on the basis of events. The approach that must be embraced is an on-going assessment of risk and proactive management of that risk (Smallman, 1996; Johnson, 2002; IRFS, 2002). Cultures that are successful in reducing risk plan strategically for its reduction using methods that develop risk profiles, establish risk targets and determine desired outcomes for their communities (Smallman, 1996; Bergel, 1997; IRFS, 2002; RST; 2004); TBC, 2000). Risk reducing cultures also adopt a "no-blame" approach to managing risk, encouraging all members to constantly be learning and applying new methods to manage and reduce risk. In a proactive risk management culture, mistakes are seen as an opportunity to learn rather than as an occasion for attaching blame. Attaching blame can lead to bottom loop bias, or the undermining of potential rewards for discovering new methods due to the reaction to mistakes (Smallman, 1996; RST, 2004; Peters, 2003; Krames, 2003; TBC, 2000).

A culture that is focused on reducing community risk will be a culture that embraces change and abandons the reasoning that because something worked in the past, it is good enough for the future. Fire service organizations that only spend 12% of their workday responding to emergency calls can no longer justify resources based on that alone. A risk reducing fire service

culture will be a culture that increasingly looks to be active in non-suppression type programs, and will train its people in education and risk management (Vonada, 1990; Bergel, 1997; RST, 2004; IRFS, 2002).

A risk reducing culture is a culture where leaders set the example. In the fire service this means the fire chief must teach and model risk reduction (Cook, 1990; Marchone, 1997; RST, 2004). The fire service culture that wants to promote risk reduction must reassess its primary mission recognizing that "the key to avoiding the adverse consequences of fire is to prevent it from happening in the first place" (IRFS, 2002, Section 3.7). In a risk reduction culture leadership ensures that funding is adequate to support risk reduction strategies.

The mission of a risk reduction culture is to target the real problems of a community based on a continual needs assessment. The risk reducing culture will accomplish this task through the development of partnerships in the community that enable full-time monitoring of the needs and wants of the citizens. As a result of this effort, "over time, the need for intervention (i.e. fire suppression) should come to be seen as a failure" (Bergel, 1997; IRFS, 2002, Section 5.8; Marchone, 1997; TBC, 2000).

Risk reducing cultures reinforce risk reduction behaviors through career paths, job descriptions, performance appraisals, planning sessions, policies and organizational objectives. Risk reduction culture can also be strengthened by replacing leaders that leave an organization with new ones that support and are committed to the reduction of risk. This new leadership can then provide the necessary vision, clear direction and support for the risk reducing culture through messages, rewards ("what's in it for me"), decisions and actions (RST, 2004; Schein, 1992; James 1996; Krames, 2003; TBC, 2000). Training, coaching, mentoring and role modeling are also important methods that leaders can use to embed risk reduction into an

organization's culture (RST, 2004; Hiam 2002; TBC, 2000). A good sign that a risk reducing organizational culture has been established is when all the members of an organization see the reduction of risk as their personal responsibility, and not just the responsibility of management or a select few (RST, 2004; IRFS 2002).

**Research Question #4: What strategies can be employed to change the culture of the Englewood Fire Division towards a focus on reducing community risk?**

The creation of a climate receptive to cultural change is dependent on an event or crisis that reveals the inadequacy of old assumptions (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Hiam, 2002; Krames, 2003; Cook, 1990). In the case of the Englewood Fire Division, this crisis has come in the form of local economic difficulties that have rocked the stability and structure of the organization over the past several years, as well as in the steady decline in the incidence of structure fires. The organization has recognized uncomfortably that it is no longer business as usual but has, as yet, formed no strategy or solution to the problem. The culture of the EFD has become dysfunctional at some very key levels (Schein, 1992; Cook, 1990). James (1996) would describe the current stage of the organization as one of denial, or perhaps bargaining to cling to obsolete invalid assumptions.

The EFD has not yet embraced what this study suggests is a need for significant cultural change. The survey indicates a need for significant work by the leadership of EFD to restore a sense of value to the line employee, to make planning and goal-setting an important organizational activity and assumption, and to create an organizational climate that encourages and supports change. Before any of the strategies below can succeed, these assumptions must be rectified (Schein, 1992); Cook, 1990). One agreed upon underlying assumption that can be a strong foundation in moving towards the future is the idea that the organization exists to serve its

customers (Schein, 1992). Vision, planning and goal-setting in terms of reducing risk to the community can be easily tied to this shared assumption.

Based on the results of the survey and the literature review the first and most important strategy for the Englewood Fire Division is the establishment of a strong organizational vision that is committed to the proactive reduction of community risk. The experts all agree on this point; the first key to changing a culture is the establishment of a strong organizational vision that the top leader(s) support and model. Second, the leaders of the EFD must consistently communicate and reinforce this vision to the organization through clearly stated organizational goals, messages, meetings, planning sessions, the Division's career path, promotions and rewards, training and professional development, the recruitment and selection of new personnel, organizational policies and procedures and most of all, budgeting (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004; Collins, 2001; Peters, 2003; Hiam, 2002; Krames, 2003; Cook, 1990; RST, 2004; TBC, 2000).

Next, the EFD must learn to assess, on a continual basis, the potential risks that are a threat to the community and develop strategies to avoid, prevent or reduce the impact of these risks. Community risk profiles must be developed that target specific risks and are focused on specifically defined outcomes. The leadership must foster a learning culture focused on learning about risk and its proactive management. Information exchange must be encouraged across all levels of the organization and with the members of the community, innovation embraced, new ideas solicited and experiments in reducing risk performed. Mistakes and failure that are a result of pushing on the previous limits of methodology must be accepted and rewarded. Visionary change makers within the organization must be identified and given the resources to realize their visions. Then they must be rewarded and celebrated as the heroes of the new culture

(Smallman, 1996; Johnson, 2002; Bergel, 1997; IRFS, 2002; TBC, 2000; Marchone, 1997).

Instead of being focused on response, the EFD must maintain a nominal response capability and focus its efforts on significantly reducing the need to respond. Fire prevention must become life-safety prevention as the Division begins to embrace the reduction of risk due to injury and other preventable medical events. The belief and conviction that the need to respond to a preventable emergency is an organizational failure must become a basic underlying assumption of the organization. Last and most important, each member of the organization must be persuaded by every means possible that he/she is critical to the successful accomplishment of the new organizational goals and vision until every member of the EFD believes community risk reduction is his/her personal responsibility (IRFS, 2002; Vonada, 1990; Johnson, 2002; Bergel, 1997; TBC, 2000).

## DISCUSSION

The Englewood Fire Division faces an uncertain future where its current underlying assumptions are dysfunctional from both an organizational standpoint and from the ability to adapt to the changes that are becoming increasingly apparent in the fire service profession. The resources studied suggest that strong leadership and vision are essential to accomplish significant cultural change in an organization (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004; Peters, 2003; Hiam, 2002; Krames, 2003; IRFS, 2002). According to the cultural assessment in this study, the EFD presently lacks both (Appendix A). Again, according to the resources studied, organizational planning and goal-setting are keys to giving culture change direction (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Krames, 2003; RST, 2004; IRFS, 2002; TBC, 2000). According to the cultural assessment, neither discipline is a strength of the EFD (Appendix A). The resources

studied suggest that employees are a significant resource to an organization, and are often the source of needed vision and initiative for change in an organization (Krames, 2003; Peters, 2003; IRFS, 2002; TBC, 2000). Currently, the line employee of the EFD feels undervalued, under-trained and in the dark as to how he/she fits in to the overall organizational scheme of goals and objectives. Additionally, innovation and change that requires organizational risk is viewed as undesirable and unsupported (Appendix A).

From a fire services standpoint the culture of the EFD remains mired in the past (Johnson, 2002; Vonada, 1990; Bergel, 1997; IRFS, 2002; Marchone, 1997). The view that fire suppression is the only strength of the organization, underscores this conclusion. In all other areas, the organization ranked itself an average or low performer. There is some foundation for change, however, in the view that prevention is more important than suppression and that reduction of community risk is the primary purpose of the fire service (Appendix A).

The implications for the EFD are clear. Change in the organizational culture is certainly needed. If organizational change is to occur, leadership must first take seriously the current state of the culture (Schein, 1992). The cultural issues cited above do not contribute to the successful introduction of cultural change. As the cultural gurus point out, dysfunctions in a culture, or underlying assumptions that hinder needed change and undermine organizational success, must be abandoned (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Krames, 2003; Peters, 2003). The process of abandoning maladaptive assumptions begins at the top with the leadership of an organization (Schein, 1992; James, 1996; Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004; Krames, 2003; Peters, 2003).

Once ineffective assumptions are abandoned, new assumptions can be built (Schein, 1992; James, 1996). For the EFD, primary among these new assumptions must be the value of the line employee. This assumption can be reinforced by leadership embracing and emphasizing

the importance of planning, vision and goal-setting. Integral to this is clearly communicating how each employee contributes to the successful accomplishment of the organizational vision and goals (Schein, 1992; James 1996; Bruch & Ghoshal, 2004; Krames, 2003).

If the dysfunctional aspects of EFD's culture can be cast off and new helpful assumptions introduced and established in their place, then there are numerous methods that can be employed to move the culture towards one that embraces the management of community risk. I have already detailed many of these in the summary to research question #4. If, however, the EFD is unsuccessful in abandoning ineffective assumptions, the last resort may be to destroy the culture completely and start over (Schein, 1992; Cook, 1990). Destroying and rebuilding the culture could be accomplished by bringing in a new leader(s), by a major structural reorganization or by merging with another fire service organization (Schein, 1992; Cook, 1990). If the EFD continues along its current path, this solution may be imposed on it from the outside.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

As mentioned in the procedures section of this paper, according to the experts, the best method of determining the underlying assumptions that form the foundation of an organizational culture is through an extensive process of interviewing employees (Schein, 1992; James, 1996). The author recommends such process for the EFD to confirm whether the results of the survey conducted as a part of this research truly represents the culture of the organization. This is the first step in changing organizational culture. If the results of the survey are confirmed the leadership of the organization must realize that the EFD is at a crossroads. All indications in the fire service are that fire suppression as we have known it for centuries is on the decline. There is a need to begin to change the EFD's culture to one that is focused on the proactive management

of risk in the community. However, before this can be accomplished some ineffective and unproductive underlying assumptions must be abandoned, some espoused goals must become underlying assumptions and some new underlying assumptions must be established and reinforced.

I have detailed several recommendations for introducing a proactive culture focused on managing and reducing community risk in the results section under the summary of research question #4. In conjunction with these recommendations, I also recommend the following; 1) as soon as is practical, the administrative and line leadership of the EFD must actively seek training in the process of establishing organizational vision and in organizational planning. 2) Following the training, this leadership group must meet as many times as necessary to establish an organizational vision based on a proactive approach to reducing community risk, one-year and five-year plans and goals and objectives for one year designed to support the vision. 3) The vision, one-year and five-year plans and annual goals and objectives must be published and distributed at meetings with all the members of the organization. At these meetings leadership must emphasize the importance of all employees to the successful accomplishment of the vision, plans, goals and objectives. 4) The organizational vision and annual goals and objectives must be posted in every fire station and in a conspicuous location in fire administration. 5) The leadership must begin to incorporate the vision, plans, goals and objectives into the formal policies and procedures of the organization. 6) Leadership must meet again to discuss and establish formal and informal reward systems designed to reinforce the organizational vision, plans and goals. 7) Future promotional opportunities must be aligned with the organizational vision, plans and goals. 8) Leadership must commit to the dismissal of any leader that does not support the organizational vision, plans and goals. 9) Leadership must develop a hiring process

that will ensure the reinforcement of the organizational vision with new people committed to it and with the skills to develop it further. 10) A "learning culture must be fostered by encouraging employee participation in innovation and change, not punishing "excellent failures", and celebrating the organization's "lead frogs". 11) The leadership must meet annually to formulate new one and five-year plans, new goals and objectives and must meet again with all employees to communicate these plans, answer questions and evaluate the progress of the organization. 12) Finally, it is recommended that on a five-year rotation, at minimum, a new cultural assessment be performed to determine if new desired assumptions are being established and embedded and if any new or old ineffective assumptions need to be eliminated .

As many of the experts the author has cited have observed, significant cultural change can take many years and requires patience and persistence. It is the author's conviction, based on the research conducted, that the recommendations contained herein can, over time, lead to an organizational culture that is focused on managing community risk.

## REFERENCES

Bregel, Peter T. (1997, May). Public Fire Safety Education: Is the Fire Service Headed in the Right Direction? *Responder*, pp. 10-11.

Bruch, Heike & Ghoshal, Sumantra (2004): *A Bias for Action: How Effective Managers Harness their Willpower, Achieve Results, and Stop Wasting Time*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Collins, Jim (2001): *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap… and Others Don't*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers Inc..

Cook, John Lee Jr. (1990, August). Changing Your Department's Organizational Culture. *Fire Engineering*, pp. 85-92.

Guldenmund, F.W (2000). The nature of safety culture: a review of theory and research. *Safety Science 34*, pp. 215-257.

Hiam, Alex (2002). *Making Horses Drink: How to Lead and Succeed in Business*. Canada: Entrepreneur Media, Inc..

Independent Review of the Fire Service (2002, December). *The Fire Service Tomorrow*. Retrieved April 19, 2005, from www.irfs.org.uk/docs/future/04.htm.

Independent Review of the Fire Service (2002, December). *Risk and Community Safety*. Retrieved April 19, 2005, from www.irfs.org.uk/docs/future/04.htm.

James, Jennifer (1996): *Thinking in the Future Tense: Leadership Skills for a New Age*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster Inc..

Johnson, David (2002, August). Developing Fire Service Planning- A Risky Business? *Fire*, pp. 16-17.

Krames, Jeffrey A. (2003). *What the Best CEOs Know: 7 Exceptional Leaders and their Lessons for Transforming any Business.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Marchone, Mary K. (1997, May). It's not just fire safety education anymore. *Fire Chief*, pp. 53-55.

Peters, Tom (2003): *Re-imagine!: Business Excellence in a Disruptive Age.* London, England: Dorling Kindersley Limited.

Risk Support Team, HM Treasury (2004, September). *Creating a Risk Management Culture: Tips for Risk Improvement Managers on bring about cultural change in Departments.* Retrieved April 18, 2005, from www.hm-treasury.gov.uk.

Schein, Edgar H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership, Second Edition*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers.

Smallman, Clive (1996, Volume 5, Number 2). Risk and Organizational Behavior: A Research Model. *Disaster Prevention and Management*, pp. 12-26.

Treasury Board of Canada (2000, March). Integrated Risk Management Framework. Retrieved April 18, 2005, from www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/pubs_pol/riskmanagement/guide.04_e.asp#.

Vonada, Mike (1990, October). Recognizing and Managing Departmental Change. *American Fire Journal*, pp. 32-33.

# APPENDIX A

## Organizational Culture Survey

| Q2 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| Most employees are highly involved in their work. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.75% |
| | Disagree | 8 | 14.04% |
| | Neutral | 10 | 17.54% |
| | Agree | 35 | 61.40% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.26% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.54 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.87 | | |
| Variance | 0.75 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 49.12% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q3** | | | |
| | | | |
| Decisions are usually made at the level where the best information is available. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 24 | 42.11% |
| | Neutral | 19 | 33.33% |
| | Agree | 13 | 22.81% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.75% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.84 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.84 | | |
| Variance | 0.71 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 63.16% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q4** | | | |
| | | | |
| Information is widely shared so that everyone can get the information he or she needs when its needed. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 4 | 7.02% |
| | Disagree | 27 | 47.37% |
| | Neutral | 13 | 22.81% |
| | Agree | 11 | 19.30% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.51% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.65 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.99 | | |
| Variance | 0.98 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 67.02% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q5** | | | |
| | | | |
| Organizational goals are clearly stated and understood by all members. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 11 | 19.30% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Disagree | 24 | 42.11% |
| | Neutral | 12 | 21.05% |
| | Agree | 9 | 15.79% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.75% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.39 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.03 | | |
| Variance | 1.06 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 72.28% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q6** | | | |
| | | | |
| Everyone believes that he or she can have a positive impact in accomplishing organizational objectives. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 7 | 12.28% |
| | Disagree | 20 | 35.09% |
| | Neutral | 18 | 31.58% |
| | Agree | 10 | 17.54% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.51% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.65 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.03 | | |
| Variance | 1.05 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 67.02% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q7** | | | |
| | | | |
| Organizational planning is ongoing and involves everyone in the process to some degree. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 14 | 24.56% |
| | Disagree | 23 | 40.35% |
| | Neutral | 15 | 26.32% |
| | Agree | 3 | 5.26% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.51% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.23 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.00 | | |
| Variance | 1.00 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 75.44% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q8** | | | |
| | | | |
| Cooperation across different parts of the organization is actively encouraged. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.79% |
| | Disagree | 17 | 30.36% |
| | Neutral | 13 | 23.21% |
| | Agree | 23 | 41.07% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.57% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.14 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.96 | | |
| Variance | 0.92 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 57.14% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q9** | | | |
| | | | |
| People work like they are part of a team. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.51% |
| | Disagree | 8 | 14.04% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 28.07% |
| | Agree | 27 | 47.37% |
| | Strongly Agree | 4 | 7.02% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.40 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.94 | | |
| Variance | 0.89 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 51.93% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q10** | | | |
| | | | |
| Teamwork is used to get work done, rather than hierarchy. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.51% |
| | Disagree | 10 | 17.54% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 28.07% |
| | Agree | 24 | 42.11% |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 | 8.77% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.35 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.99 | | |
| Variance | 0.98 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 52.98% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q11** | | | |
| | | | |
| Teams are our primary building blocks. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.75% |
| | Disagree | 8 | 14.04% |
| | Neutral | 13 | 22.81% |
| | Agree | 24 | 42.11% |
| | Strongly Agree | 11 | 19.30% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.63 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.01 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Variance | 1.02 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 47.37% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q12** | | | |
| | | | |
| Work is organized so that each person can see the relationship between his or her job and the goals of the organization. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 8.77% |
| | Disagree | 22 | 38.60% |
| | Neutral | 17 | 29.82% |
| | Agree | 11 | 19.30% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.51% |
| **Total** | | **57** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.70 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.00 | | |
| Variance | 1.00 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 65.96% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q13** | | | |
| | | | |
| When appropriate, authority is delegated so that people can act on their own. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.57% |
| | Disagree | 12 | 21.43% |
| | Neutral | 13 | 23.21% |
| | Agree | 26 | 46.43% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.36% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.29 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.99 | | |
| Variance | 0.97 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 54.29% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q14** | | | |
| | | | |
| The capability of employees is constantly improving. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.79% |
| | Disagree | 7 | 12.50% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 28.57% |
| | Agree | 28 | 50.00% |
| | Strongly Agree | 4 | 7.14% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.48 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.87 | | |
| Variance | 0.76 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 50.36% | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Q15** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is continuous investment in the skills of employees. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Disagree | 17 | 30.91% |
| | Neutral | 17 | 30.91% |
| | Agree | 16 | 29.09% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.95 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.99 | | |
| Variance | 0.98 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 61.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q16** | | | |
| | | | |
| The capabilities of people are viewed as an important resource and advantage to the organization. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Disagree | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Neutral | 9 | 16.36% |
| | Agree | 26 | 47.27% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.45% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.24 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.04 | | |
| Variance | 1.07 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 55.27% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q17** | | | |
| | | | |
| Problems often arise because we do not have the skills necessary to do the job. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 3 | 5.36% |
| | Disagree | 28 | 50.00% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 28.57% |
| | Agree | 6 | 10.71% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.36% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.61 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.95 | | |
| Variance | 0.90 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 67.86% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q18** | | | |
| | | | |
| Our leaders and supervisors practice what they preach. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Strongly Disagree | 9 | 16.07% |
| | Disagree | 19 | 33.93% |
| | Neutral | 19 | 33.93% |
| | Agree | 7 | 12.50% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.57% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.54 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.03 | | |
| Variance | 1.05 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.29% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q19** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is a characteristic management style and a distinct set of management practices. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 4 | 7.14% |
| | Disagree | 14 | 25.00% |
| | Neutral | 19 | 33.93% |
| | Agree | 16 | 28.57% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.36% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.00 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.03 | | |
| Variance | 1.05 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 60.00% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q20** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is a clear and consistent set of values that governs the way we do business. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 14.29% |
| | Disagree | 15 | 26.79% |
| | Neutral | 9 | 16.07% |
| | Agree | 22 | 39.29% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.57% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.91 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.18 | | |
| Variance | 1.39 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 61.79% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q21** | | | |
| | | | |
| Ignoring core values will get you in trouble. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.79% |
| | Disagree | 3 | 5.36% |
| | Neutral | 14 | 25.00% |
| | Agree | 24 | 42.86% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Strongly Agree | 14 | 25.00% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.84 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.93 | | |
| Variance | 0.86 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 43.21% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q22** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is an ethical code that guides our behavior and tells us right from wrong. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.57% |
| | Disagree | 4 | 7.14% |
| | Neutral | 12 | 21.43% |
| | Agree | 26 | 46.43% |
| | Strongly Agree | 12 | 21.43% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.75 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.00 | | |
| Variance | 0.99 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 45.00% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q23** | | | |
| | | | |
| When disagreements occur, we work hard to achieve win-win solutions. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.57% |
| | Disagree | 24 | 42.86% |
| | Neutral | 22 | 39.29% |
| | Agree | 6 | 10.71% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.57% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.68 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.86 | | |
| Variance | 0.73 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 66.43% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q24** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is a strong culture. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.79% |
| | Disagree | 6 | 10.71% |
| | Neutral | 14 | 25.00% |
| | Agree | 28 | 50.00% |
| | Strongly Agree | 7 | 12.50% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.61 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Standard Dev. | 0.91 | | |
| Variance | 0.82 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 47.86% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q25** | | | |
| | | | |
| It is easy to reach consensus, even on difficult issues. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 8.93% |
| | Disagree | 29 | 51.79% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 28.57% |
| | Agree | 5 | 8.93% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.79% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.43 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.85 | | |
| Variance | 0.72 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 71.43% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q26** | | | |
| | | | |
| We often have trouble reaching agreement on key issues. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Disagree | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Neutral | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Agree | 34 | 61.82% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.45% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.65 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.73 | | |
| Variance | 0.53 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 46.91% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q27** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is a clear agreement about the right way and the wrong way to do things. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 4 | 7.14% |
| | Disagree | 20 | 35.71% |
| | Neutral | 21 | 37.50% |
| | Agree | 10 | 17.86% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.79% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.71 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.91 | | |
| Variance | 0.83 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 65.71% | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Q28** | | | |
| | | | |
| Our approach to doing business is very consistent and predictable. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 3 | 5.36% |
| | Disagree | 17 | 30.36% |
| | Neutral | 13 | 23.21% |
| | Agree | 20 | 35.71% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.36% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.05 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.05 | | |
| Variance | 1.11 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 58.93% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q29** | | | |
| | | | |
| People from different parts of the organization share a common perspective. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 9 | 16.07% |
| | Disagree | 21 | 37.50% |
| | Neutral | 14 | 25.00% |
| | Agree | 11 | 19.64% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.79% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.54 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.04 | | |
| Variance | 1.09 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.29% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q30** | | | |
| | | | |
| It is easy to coordinate projects across different parts of the organization. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 6 | 10.71% |
| | Disagree | 27 | 48.21% |
| | Neutral | 14 | 25.00% |
| | Agree | 8 | 14.29% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.79% |
| **Total** | | **56** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.48 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.93 | | |
| Variance | 0.87 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 70.36% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q31** | | | |
| | | | |
| Working with someone from another part of this organization is like working with someone from a different | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| organization. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 9 | 16.36% |
| | Neutral | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Agree | 23 | 41.82% |
| | Strongly Agree | 5 | 9.09% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.44 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.88 | | |
| Variance | 0.77 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 51.27% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q32** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is good alignment of goals across all levels of the organization. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 14.55% |
| | Disagree | 21 | 38.18% |
| | Neutral | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Agree | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.49 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.96 | | |
| Variance | 0.92 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 70.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q33** | | | |
| | | | |
| The way things are done is flexible and open to change. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 6 | 10.91% |
| | Disagree | 22 | 40.00% |
| | Neutral | 19 | 34.55% |
| | Agree | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.55 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.92 | | |
| Variance | 0.85 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q34** | | | |
| | | | |
| We respond well to changes in the fire service profession. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 9.26% |
| | Disagree | 31 | 57.41% |
| | Neutral | 12 | 22.22% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Agree | 5 | 9.26% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.85% |
| **Total** | | **54** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.37 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.85 | | |
| Variance | 0.73 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 72.59% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q35** | | | |
| | | | |
| New and improved methods to accomplish tasks are continually developed and adopted. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Disagree | 20 | 36.36% |
| | Neutral | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Agree | 11 | 20.00% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.69 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.96 | | |
| Variance | 0.92 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 66.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q36** | | | |
| | | | |
| Attempts to introduce change are usually met with resistance. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Neutral | 11 | 20.00% |
| | Agree | 36 | 65.45% |
| | Strongly Agree | 7 | 12.73% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.89 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.63 | | |
| Variance | 0.40 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 42.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q37** | | | |
| | | | |
| Different parts of the organization often cooperate to introduce positive change. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Disagree | 22 | 40.00% |
| | Neutral | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Agree | 11 | 20.00% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mean | 2.80 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.93 | | |
| Variance | 0.87 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 64.00% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q38** | | | |
| | | | |
| Customer comments and recommendations often lead to changes in how we do business. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Disagree | 17 | 30.91% |
| | Neutral | 22 | 40.00% |
| | Agree | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.95 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.85 | | |
| Variance | 0.72 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 61.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q39** | | | |
| | | | |
| Customer input directly influences our decisions. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Disagree | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Neutral | 23 | 41.82% |
| | Agree | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.00 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.90 | | |
| Variance | 0.81 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 60.00% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q40** | | | |
| | | | |
| All members have a clear understanding of customer wants and needs. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 8 | 14.55% |
| | Neutral | 19 | 34.55% |
| | Agree | 25 | 45.45% |
| | Strongly Agree | 3 | 5.45% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.42 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Standard Dev. | 0.81 | | |
| Variance | 0.66 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 51.64% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q41** | | | |
| | | | |
| The interests of the customer often get ignored in our decisions. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Disagree | 26 | 47.27% |
| | Neutral | 20 | 36.36% |
| | Agree | 6 | 10.91% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.60 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.81 | | |
| Variance | 0.65 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 68.00% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q42** | | | |
| | | | |
| We encourage our people to have direct contact with our customers. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 3 | 5.56% |
| | Neutral | 7 | 12.96% |
| | Agree | 30 | 55.56% |
| | Strongly Agree | 14 | 25.93% |
| **Total** | | **54** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 4.02 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.79 | | |
| Variance | 0.62 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 39.63% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q43** | | | |
| | | | |
| We view failure as an opportunity for learning and improvement. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Disagree | 17 | 30.91% |
| | Neutral | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Agree | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.98 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.01 | | |
| Variance | 1.02 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 60.36% | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Q44** | | | |
| | | | |
| Innovation and risk taking are encouraged and rewarded. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 6 | 10.91% |
| | Disagree | 23 | 41.82% |
| | Neutral | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Agree | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.53 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.92 | | |
| Variance | 0.85 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.45% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q45** | | | |
| | | | |
| Lots of things seem to fall between the cracks. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Neutral | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Agree | 23 | 41.82% |
| | Strongly Agree | 15 | 27.27% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.91 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.87 | | |
| Variance | 0.75 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 41.82% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q46** | | | |
| | | | |
| Learning and improving is an important objective in our day-to-day work. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Neutral | 9 | 16.36% |
| | Agree | 30 | 54.55% |
| | Strongly Agree | 9 | 16.36% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.75 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.89 | | |
| Variance | 0.79 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 45.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q47** | | | |
| | | | |
| We make certain that the right hand knows what the left hand is doing. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Strongly Disagree | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Disagree | 23 | 41.82% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 29.09% |
| | Agree | 8 | 14.55% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.51 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.96 | | |
| Variance | 0.92 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.82% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q48** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is a long-term purpose and direction for the organization. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 16 | 29.09% |
| | Disagree | 16 | 29.09% |
| | Neutral | 17 | 30.91% |
| | Agree | 4 | 7.27% |
| | Strongly Agree | 2 | 3.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.27 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.08 | | |
| Variance | 1.16 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 74.55% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q49** | | | |
| | | | |
| Our strategy leads other fire service organizations to change the way they do business. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Disagree | 24 | 43.64% |
| | Neutral | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.11 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.88 | | |
| Variance | 0.77 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 77.82% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q50** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is a clear mission that gives meaning and direction to our work. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 18.52% |
| | Disagree | 13 | 24.07% |
| | Neutral | 14 | 25.93% |
| | Agree | 13 | 24.07% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Strongly Agree | 4 | 7.41% |
| **Total** | | **54** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.78 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.22 | | |
| Variance | 1.50 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 64.44% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q51** | | | |
| | | | |
| The reduction of community risk is the primary purpose of the fire service. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Neutral | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Agree | 26 | 47.27% |
| | Strongly Agree | 13 | 23.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.91 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.80 | | |
| Variance | 0.64 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 41.82% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q52** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is a clear strategy for the future. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 19 | 34.55% |
| | Disagree | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Neutral | 17 | 30.91% |
| | Agree | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.13 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.02 | | |
| Variance | 1.04 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 77.45% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q53** | | | |
| | | | |
| Our strategic direction is unclear to me. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Disagree | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Neutral | 11 | 20.00% |
| | Agree | 27 | 49.09% |
| | Strongly Agree | 13 | 23.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.87 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Standard Dev. | 0.90 | | |
| Variance | 0.82 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 42.55% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q54** | | | |
| | | | |
| There is widespread agreement about goals. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 8 | 14.55% |
| | Disagree | 21 | 38.18% |
| | Neutral | 20 | 36.36% |
| | Agree | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.45 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.92 | | |
| Variance | 0.85 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 70.91% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q55** | | | |
| | | | |
| Leaders set goals that are ambitious, but realistic. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Disagree | 16 | 29.09% |
| | Neutral | 19 | 34.55% |
| | Agree | 12 | 21.82% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.71 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.01 | | |
| Variance | 1.02 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 65.82% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q56** | | | |
| | | | |
| The leadership has gone on record about the objectives we are trying to meet. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 9 | 16.36% |
| | Disagree | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Neutral | 19 | 34.55% |
| | Agree | 8 | 14.55% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.53 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.00 | | |
| Variance | 0.99 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.45% | | |
| | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Q57** | | | |
| | | | |
| We continuously track our progress against our stated goals. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 10 | 18.18% |
| | Disagree | 26 | 47.27% |
| | Neutral | 13 | 23.64% |
| | Agree | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.29 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.94 | | |
| Variance | 0.88 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 74.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q58** | | | |
| | | | |
| Our people understand what needs to be done for the organization to succeed in the long term. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 6 | 10.91% |
| | Disagree | 19 | 34.55% |
| | Neutral | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Agree | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.73 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.03 | | |
| Variance | 1.05 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 65.45% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q59** | | | |
| | | | |
| The members of the EFD have a common vision of what the organization will be like in the future. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 12 | 21.82% |
| | Disagree | 26 | 47.27% |
| | Neutral | 11 | 20.00% |
| | Agree | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.22 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.96 | | |
| Variance | 0.91 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 75.64% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q60** | | | |
| | | | |
| Prevention is preferable to suppression. | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Strongly Disagree | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Disagree | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Neutral | 10 | 18.18% |
| | Agree | 34 | 61.82% |
| | Strongly Agree | 9 | 16.36% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.89 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.76 | | |
| Variance | 0.58 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 42.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q61** | | | |
| | | | |
| Suppression is preferable to prevention. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 6 | 10.91% |
| | Disagree | 34 | 61.82% |
| | Neutral | 10 | 18.18% |
| | Agree | 4 | 7.27% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.27 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.83 | | |
| Variance | 0.68 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 74.55% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q62** | | | |
| | | | |
| Our leaders have a strong vision for the future of the organization. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Disagree | 17 | 30.91% |
| | Neutral | 18 | 32.73% |
| | Agree | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.31 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.02 | | |
| Variance | 1.03 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 73.82% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q63** | | | |
| | | | |
| Short-term thinking often compromises our long-term vision. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Disagree | 2 | 3.70% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 29.63% |
| | Agree | 24 | 44.44% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Strongly Agree | 12 | 22.22% |
| **Total** | | **54** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.85 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.81 | | |
| Variance | 0.66 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 42.96% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q64** | | | |
| | | | |
| Our organizational vision creates excitement and motivates our employees. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Disagree | 25 | 45.45% |
| | Neutral | 11 | 20.00% |
| | Agree | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.09 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.93 | | |
| Variance | 0.86 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 78.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q65** | | | |
| | | | |
| We are able to meet short-term demands without compromising our long-term vision. | | | |
| | Strongly Disagree | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Disagree | 20 | 36.36% |
| | Neutral | 24 | 43.64% |
| | Agree | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Strongly Agree | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.58 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.85 | | |
| Variance | 0.73 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 68.36% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q66** | | | |
| | | | |
| The following set of questions asks about the performance of the Englewood Fire Division. Compared to other fire organizations, how would you assess the EFDs performance in the following areas?<br>Fire Suppression | | | |
| | Don't Know | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Low Performer | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Average Performer | 2 | 3.64% |
| | High Performer | 32 | 58.18% |
| | Elite Performer | 20 | 36.36% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mean | 4.29 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.63 | | |
| Variance | 0.40 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 34.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q67** | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Fire Prevention | |
| | Don't Know | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Low Performer | 6 | 10.91% |
| | Average Performer | 25 | 45.45% |
| | High Performer | 20 | 36.36% |
| | Elite Performer | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.18 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.86 | | |
| Variance | 0.74 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 56.36% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q68** | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Public Safety Education | |
| | Don't Know | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Low Performer | 9 | 16.36% |
| | Average Performer | 28 | 50.91% |
| | High Performer | 14 | 25.45% |
| | Elite Performer | 2 | 3.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.09 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.84 | | |
| Variance | 0.71 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 58.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q69** | | | |
| | | | |
| | | Management of Community Risk | |
| | Don't Know | 11 | 20.00% |
| | Low Performer | 10 | 18.18% |
| | Average Performer | 23 | 41.82% |
| | High Performer | 9 | 16.36% |
| | Elite Performer | 2 | 3.64% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.65 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.09 | | |
| Variance | 1.19 | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mean Percentile | 66.91% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q70** | | | |
| | | | |
| Special Teams (Haz Mat, Tech Rescue, Wildland etc...) | | | |
| | Don't Know | 0 | 0.00% |
| | Low Performer | 22 | 40.00% |
| | Average Performer | 20 | 36.36% |
| | High Performer | 9 | 16.36% |
| | Elite Performer | 4 | 7.27% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.91 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.93 | | |
| Variance | 0.86 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 61.82% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q71** | | | |
| | | | |
| Organizational Planning | | | |
| | Don't Know | 4 | 7.27% |
| | Low Performer | 33 | 60.00% |
| | Average Performer | 15 | 27.27% |
| | High Performer | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Elite Performer | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.33 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.75 | | |
| Variance | 0.56 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 73.45% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q72** | | | |
| | | | |
| Organizational Leadership | | | |
| | Don't Know | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Low Performer | 26 | 47.27% |
| | Average Performer | 20 | 36.36% |
| | High Performer | 5 | 9.09% |
| | Elite Performer | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.55 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.81 | | |
| Variance | 0.66 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q73** | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| Organizational Vision | | | |
| | Don't Know | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Low Performer | 31 | 56.36% |
| | Average Performer | 12 | 21.82% |
| | High Performer | 4 | 7.27% |
| | Elite Performer | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.29 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.85 | | |
| Variance | 0.73 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 74.18% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q74** | | | |
| | | | |
| Employee Satisfaction | | | |
| | Don't Know | 2 | 3.64% |
| | Low Performer | 26 | 47.27% |
| | Average Performer | 23 | 41.82% |
| | High Performer | 3 | 5.45% |
| | Elite Peformer | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.55 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.74 | | |
| Variance | 0.55 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q75** | | | |
| | | | |
| Overall Organizational Performance | | | |
| | Don't Know | 1 | 1.82% |
| | Low Performer | 15 | 27.27% |
| | Average Performer | 31 | 56.36% |
| | High Performer | 7 | 12.73% |
| | Elite Performer | 1 | 1.82% |
| **Total** | | **55** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.85 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.73 | | |
| Variance | 0.53 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 62.91% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q76** | | | |
| | | | |
| Age | | | |
| | Under 20 | 0 | 0.00% |
| | 20-29 | 12 | 25.53% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 30-39 | 9 | 19.15% |
| | 40-49 | 13 | 27.66% |
| | 50-59 | 13 | 27.66% |
| | over 60 | 0 | 0.00% |
| **Total** | | **47** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.57 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.16 | | |
| Variance | 1.34 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 57.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q77** | | | |
| | | | |
| Education (highest level) | | | |
| | High School | 1 | 2.22% |
| | Some College | 19 | 42.22% |
| | Associate's/Technical Degree | 9 | 20.00% |
| | Bachelor's Degree | 10 | 22.22% |
| | Some Graduate Work | 5 | 11.11% |
| | Master's Degree | 1 | 2.22% |
| **Total** | | **45** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 3.04 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.19 | | |
| Variance | 1.41 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 65.93% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q78** | | | |
| | | | |
| Function | | | |
| | Firefighter | 12 | 27.27% |
| | Firemedic | 11 | 25.00% |
| | Driver/Operator/Engineer | 10 | 22.73% |
| | Captain/Lieutenant | 7 | 15.91% |
| | Chief Officer | 4 | 9.09% |
| **Total** | | **44** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 2.55 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 1.30 | | |
| Variance | 1.70 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 69.09% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q79** | | | |
| | | | |
| Organizational Level | | | |
| | Line, non-supervisor | 33 | 73.33% |
| | Line, supervisor | 9 | 20.00% |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Administration | 3 | 6.67% |
| **Total** | | **45** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 1.33 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 0.60 | | |
| Variance | 0.36 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 88.89% | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| **Q80** | | | |
| | | | |
| Years with Organization | | | |
| | Less than 6 months | 2 | 4.44% |
| | 6 months-1 year | 2 | 4.44% |
| | 1-2 years | 4 | 8.89% |
| | 2-4 years | 3 | 6.67% |
| | 4-6 years | 2 | 4.44% |
| | 6-10 years | 8 | 17.78% |
| | 10-15 years | 2 | 4.44% |
| | More than 15 years | 17 | 37.78% |
| | Prefer not to state | 5 | 11.11% |
| **Total** | | **45** | |
| | | | |
| Mean | 6.29 | | |
| Standard Dev. | 2.35 | | |
| Variance | 5.53 | | |
| Mean Percentile | 41.23% | | |
| | | | |

## Open Ended Questions Report

(Blank rows indicate the respondent chose not to provide any data)

What do you believe are the 3-5 most critical issues that face our organization today?

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Lack of a 5 year plan<br>Lack of a Fire Chief -per se<br>Questionable finances and City commitment |
| 2 | Lack of adminstrative staff support<br>Lack of adequate funding for operations<br>Lack of vision and planning |
| 3 | |
| 4 | 1. Lack of the city to see our employees as critical to the citizens needs.<br>2. Lack of upper administration to look for positive goals and training to benefit the department and the community.<br>3. Double standards for line employees and upper administration people. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | 1. Morale<br>2. Future growth<br>3. Lack of in-house respect |
| 7 | -Long term goals in general.<br>-How to continue the same level of service as in the past, on a budget that has not changed much.<br>-Long term goals to replace equipment.<br>-Maintaining and or remodeling stations. |
| 8 | No long term planning<br>Lack of stated goals and direction<br>Inconsistent efforcement of policies |
| 9 | |
| 10 | Lack of, or support of, change<br>Personalities and egos run the division not practices or principles |
| 11 | |
| 12 | 1.) Strategic long term planning that prioritizes service levels.<br>2.) Changing the organizational culture from a "suppression" to "prevention" mindset.<br>3.) Professional development of our personnel. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | Training<br>Personnel development<br>Preparing leadership for future changes |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Leadership<br>Vision<br>Planning<br>Training<br>Follow thru |
| 17 | Development and conveyance of vision/goals/strategy.<br><br>Address aging facilities, equipment deficiencies(communications especially)<br><br>Restructure organization back to separate fire and police departments. |
| 18 | Lack of leadership,<br>department expects everything to be volunteered,dept wants all little programs but refuses to support them financially, |
| 19 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Moral, Apparatus and I.S.O. rating. |
| 20 | |
| 21 | 1. Manpower 2. training 3. motivation 4. Change 5. Budget |
| 22 | |
| 23 | surviving as a progressive and satisfying place to work when one considers that the employees and their worth are minimized by our employer.<br><br>Compensating our line personnel equally with our professional peers.<br><br>Installing supervisory and administrative personnel who truly consider their employees valuable and worthwhile and openly promote them as such. |
| 24 | Economic condition of city.<br>Funding of fire department.<br>Retention of quality employees. |
| 25 | |
| 26 | Leadership, training opportunity, budget, wages and benefits and morale. |
| 27 | 1) Future<br>2) How we're preceived by the public<br>3) The Financial end |
| 28 | Truck Replacemnt, Station remodel/relocation, Firefighter safety(R.I.T.) |
| 29 | Training, Moral, Pay |
| 30 | |
| 31 | Too Many conflicting priorities no clear goals<br>Lack of trust with line personnel<br>A need for leadership |
| 32 | Disconnects between shifts<br>Condition of the stations<br>Disconnects between the city and the fire division |
| 33 | |
| 34 | lack of confidance in organizational leadership, lack of vision for the future, no administrative support for motivation and innovation |
| 35 | equipment,special teams,bringing our new staff up to speed |
| 36 | employee morale.<br>line-staff cooperation.<br>fire dept-city admin trust. |
| 37 | 1)FireMedic burn out<br>2)Lack of man power |
| 38 | Manning,<br>Organizational Goal (lack of)<br>Command Staff |
| 39 | Money,communcation, lack of support,Discrepauncy in disciplinry actions. |
| 40 | N/A |
| 41 | |
| 42 | 5 year plan<br>change<br>career development |
| 43 | Pay, Staffing, Training |
| 44 | |
| 45 | |
| 46 | 1. Lack of true Mission Statement<br>2. No long term goals<br>3. No short term goals to help us gain the long term goals<br>4. "Us v.s. Them" attitude between admin. and line<br>5. Lack of consistency in administrations attitude. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 47 | City administration, fire administration, long range planning |
| 48 | Budget issues will continue to dictate our future. We need to put more money into our programs to make them effective. We need to have a defined mission. I feel that our mission and vision change too frequently. |
| 49 | Employee turnover<br>Failure to support adjunct programs<br>Lack of outside training opportunities |
| 50 | Leadership, Pay, the attitude of the employee, and the ability to change in areas of need; leadership, suppresion, equipment ect. |
| 51 | relistic budget, daily and long term operations, management structure |
| 52 | |
| 53 | Pay<br>departing personell<br>benefits |
| 54 | salary, equipment, retirement health care |
| 55 | Funding and staffing, morale, |
| 56 | |

**What do you believe are the 3-5 most critical issues that will face our organization over the next five years?**

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Budget resolutions<br>Lack of a clear direction<br>allocation of resources matching the needs. |
| 2 | Status quo or declining resources<br>Increasing public expectations<br>Maintaining employee motivation in light of the above |
| 3 | |
| 4 | 1. Not improving our EMS division, and stepping up our level and number of Paramedics.<br>2. Lack of the City to abide by the union contract, and see our division as the most important part of the city, including the police division.<br>3. Motivating people through "Pay for Performance" rather than the current standard. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | 1. The same as above if not corrected |
| 7 | -Large turnover of employee's.<br>-Apparatus replacement.<br>-Stations are falling apart.(pluming, HVAC, structure.)<br>-A younger generation of employee will lead to experience issues and training issues. |
| 8 | No long term planning<br>Lack of stated goals and direction<br>Personnel changes |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | 1.)Unstable economy. (This exacerbates the need for strategic planning)<br>2.)Professional development of a new generation of firefighters.<br>3.)Homeland Security issues that may occur at the local level and the false sense of security that exists on behalf of the community that the first<br>responders can "fix" anything.<br>4.)Local politicians lack of understanding of what service and value the Fire Department provides to the community. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | Same as above, plus |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Facility and equipment upgrades and enhancement |
| 15 | |
| 16 | Planning<br>Training |
| 17 | Educate the civic leadership re: adequate staffing in light of homeland security demands and increasing call load/hazards.<br><br>Establish replacement cycles for equipment. |
| 18 | having hired people that were not qualified and these people in turn will be promoted,:refusal of sending personnel to paramedic school; |
| 19 | above |
| 20 | |
| 21 | 1.Budget 2. Training 3. Change |
| 22 | |
| 23 | Maintaining our position within the community in opposition to a city government unwilling to support their employees as worthwhile and valuable assets.<br><br>Installing an administration with the courage to promote the organization within the administrative structure of the city.<br><br>Maintaining the level of service to the community that now exists without diminishing the means of doing so even further. |
| 24 | see above |
| 25 | |
| 26 | The replacement of the Division Chief and the motivation of the individual to provide a vision for the future. People need to see the short and long term objectives of this organization being achieved. These goals and objectives need to be clear and obtainable so members can be a part of the change. The tradition of the Fire Department can be preserved with this department being progressive. |
| 27 | 1) Financial<br>2) Financial<br>3) Financial |
| 28 | Truck Replacement, Station remodels/relocation, Staffing, Firefighter Safety on fires(R.I.T.), |
| 29 | same |
| 30 | |
| 31 | Top management leadership<br>Clear goals with consistant priorities<br>Good Hiring Practices<br>Not asking paramedics to go to school on their own time<br>Not hiring firefighters that have already been trained |
| 32 | Future leadership<br>Funding / Revenue |
| 33 | |
| 34 | |
| 35 | vision,leadership,budget |
| 36 | funding to replace T-22.<br>line supervisor development.<br>training new paramedics.<br>loss/retirement of experienced personnel. |
| 37 | 1)buget<br>2)More training for teror attacks<br>3)Make sure fire traning never takes back seat to other training stays #1 priority. |
| 38 | Organizational Goals<br>Command Staff<br>Manning |

| | |
|---|---|
| 39 | same |
| 40 | N/A |
| 41 | |
| 42 | same |
| 43 | See above. |
| 44 | |
| 45 | |
| 46 | 1. Accountability i.e. certification.<br>2. Declining ISO ratings translate<br>into declining level of service<br>provided.<br>3. Lack of organizational structure<br>will cause past lessons to<br>be "relearned" as experience<br>retires. |
| 47 | The same as above |
| 48 | Still budget, In a perfect world we would figure out some kind of tax base to supply public safety with the funds needed to run a successful organization. |
| 49 | Distrust between city admin and fire<br>Failure of Fire admin and employees to recognise each others interests and needs.<br>Failure by all parties to recognise the weaknesses of the safety services conceptand lack of discussion about alternatives |
| 50 | Upper management, the education of the community and city councol of the service that we provide and the need that are our not being met. |
| 51 | budget,retention, proactive culture |
| 52 | |
| 53 | Pay<br>benifits<br>retiree health insurance |
| 54 | same |
| 55 | same as above |
| 56 | |

**Please enter any other information that you feel may be relevant to this survey and research topic.**

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | |
| 2 | Organization needs to sharpen focus on proactive risk reduction by allocating both human and economic resources to this effort. |
| 3 | |
| 4 | I think that most employees in any job work harder, and are most motivated to engage in meaningful activities when they feel appreciated by their managment, rather than being motivated out of fear of punishment. |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | Over all Englewood Fire Division is not so different from many other departments of our size. Recent economic issues have lead to low pay, no raises, FERLO, and other financial problems. This can also account for some turnover and poor moral. While I am optimistic that this will eventually change it is still a concern. Recently the Division has hired numerous new employee's over the last few years, it has been a challenge to keep these good people motivated and up beat do to the circumstances that I just mentioned. Currently Englewood Fire Division is at a crossroads, it is an exciting time but one full of uncertainty. |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | There exists a discernible elitism in staff leading to a palpable us v. them atmosphere. |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | Leadership, we need it in a big way. People want to work for a true leader and will give sacrifice if there are just rewards. |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| 29 | |
| 30 | |
| 31 | |
| 32 | |
| 33 | |
| 34 | |
| 35 | |
| 36 | |
| 37 | |
| 38 | Goals for the Organization seem to be lacking, 1yr. 2yr. 5yr. 10yr. plan<br>If there is a plan (s) I am not aware of them |
| 39 | Teams like the wildland team got a low score because they have no suppport. We have members willing to go out and get training but the dept is unwilling to buy proper PPE or tools. Members are willing to be on special teams or side teams ,but the dept refuses to spend money on proper equipment or to compensate them. |
| 40 | N/A |
| 41 | |
| 42 | |
| 43 | |
| 44 | |
| 45 | |
| 46 | It appears from my position that administration has lost it's focus of providing a platform of direction and support for line operations. The lack of direction translates into an attitude of "trying to just maintain". |
| 47 | |
| 48 | Basically, we need to have some long range planning for the betterment of the organinzation. |
| 49 | |
| 50 | |
| 51 | |
| 52 | |

| | |
|---|---|
| 53 | |
| 54 | |
| 55 | |
| 56 | |